

July 1952

The Department of State bulletin

Vol. XXVII, No. 698

November 10, 1952



THE PRISONER QUESTION AND PEACE IN KOREA • <i>General Assembly Statement by Secretary Acheson</i> . . .	744
THE FREE WORLD REDISCOVERS TURKEY • <i>by Assistant Secretary Byrnes</i>	753
AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY IN TODAY'S WORLD • <i>by Assistant Secretary Sargent</i>	756
OIL IMPORTS AND THE U.S. ECONOMY • <i>by</i> <i>Robert H. S. Rabine</i>	758
HUMAN RIGHTS PROVISIONS IN THE PUERTO RICOAN CONSTITUTION	759
CONTINUED SUPPORT URGED FOR PALESTINE REFUGEE PROGRAM • <i>Statement by Philip C. Jessup</i> .	755
RELIGION AND THE VOICE OF AMERICA • <i>Article by Roger Lyons</i>	757

For index see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXVII, No. 698 • PUBLICATION 4779

November 10, 1952

The Department of State BULLETIN,
a weekly publication compiled and
edited in the Division of Publications,
Office of Public Affairs, provides the
public and interested agencies of
the Government with information on
developments in the field of foreign
relations and on the work of the De-
partment of State and the Foreign
Service. The BULLETIN includes
selected press releases on foreign pol-
icy issued by the White House and
the Department, and statements and
addresses made by the President and
by the Secretary of State and other
officers of the Department, as well as
special articles on various phases of
international affairs and the func-
tions of the Department. Informa-
tion is included concerning treaties
and international agreements to
which the United States is or may
become a party and treaties of gen-
eral international interest.

Publications of the Department, as
well as legislative material in the field
of international relations, are listed
currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has
been approved by the Director of the
Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not
copyrighted and items contained herein may
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT
of STATE BULLETIN as the source will be
appreciated.

Religion and the Voice of America

by Roger Lyons

In the field of religion, the Voice of America seeks to encourage the free people of the world in their search for the divine. And to those constantly barraged by Soviet propaganda, the VOA seeks merely to tell the truth—to tell the real story of the place religion holds in the United States and the rest of the free world and in the Soviet Union.

In its efforts to inform its audience about the place of religion in the United States, the VOA has the benefit of counsel from the Religious Advisory Panel of the International Information Administration.¹

How does the Voice present the spiritual factors of American life? It covers important religious news; it records conferences, religious services, and statements by church leaders and members. It gives attention to important religious holidays, both those celebrated in the United States and those of the areas to which programs are beamed. It rebroadcasts domestic programs on religious themes, for example, Christmas and Easter programs, sermons, or special messages by the clergy.

Yet in presenting the positive contributions of religion in American life, the VOA does not confine itself to programs of this sort. Since spiritual and moral factors constitute a fundamental premise motivating the personal, social, and working lives of the American people, the Voice seeks to convey the importance of these influences in its programs, whether they tell the story of a mid-

¹ The Voice of America is the broadcasting service of the International Information Administration. The other major services are press and publications, motion pictures, exchange of persons, and the overseas information centers.

The Religious Advisory Panel consists of Dr. Albert J. McCartney, religious adviser, International Information Administration; Isaac Franck, executive director, Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington; Monsignor Thomas McCarthy, director, Bureau of Information, National Catholic Welfare Conference; and Dr. Edward Pruden, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Washington and former president of the American Baptist Convention.

western farmer, cover a meeting of the American Foreign Policy Association, or record a village church service.

The Problem of Language Barriers

It is a relatively simple problem to tell English-speaking peoples about American spiritual life. It is more difficult in other cases, although the problem of language barriers has been largely solved. For the most part, VOA reports religion through translation, through the news, and through commentaries.

A specialized knowledge of the religious climate of each listening area, as well as of its culture as a whole, is required. Each language unit of the VOA has personnel specializing in the treatment of religious subjects.

To Europe and the Far East goes a regular half-hour religious weekly broadcast called "A Nation at Worship," which is transmitted in English. It includes broadcasts taken from domestic radio programs and services specially recorded for the VOA. The latter are mostly denominational and are carefully selected to represent proportionately the major faiths.

Broadcasting to Yugoslavia presents a special problem because of the country's mixed population. The great majority of its Serbians are Orthodox; the Croatians and Slovenes are Catholic. To satisfy all religious and language groups, the Yugoslav service of the VOA broadcast 18 different Christmas programs last year. Since 11 percent of the population is Moslem, the Yugoslav service also gives attention to important Moslem events.

In Finland, Poland, and Greece, the dominant religions are Lutheran, Catholic, and Greek Orthodox respectively. To be acceptable, religious programs for these countries must center largely around these denominations. For each area the religious makeup of the audience demands a different approach. Arabic broadcasts operate on the principle that the Koran enjoins upon Moslems

belief in Christ as a great prophet and tolerance of Christianity and Christians. On Fridays and Moslem holidays the Voice broadcasts readings from the Koran; Christian holidays are observed, and Christian features are often used on Sundays.

Bias Avoided in Broadcasts

Events of universal significance, such as "World Brotherhood Week," "World Day of Prayer," and movements of prayers for the oppressed behind the Iron Curtain receive attention. Interdenominational broadcasts are included wherever possible. Special services on religious holidays and for persecuted peoples are frequently recorded and broadcast, and religious music and dramatizations of religious themes are also commonly beamed. Religious programming is most effective when it demonstrates practically and in a human way the virtues of charity, religious tolerance, and cooperation among different racial and religious groups.

The Voice of America, it must be remembered, represents abroad a form of government which separates church and state and which guarantees in its Constitution complete religious freedom. VOA does not originate programs which might be interpreted as officially advocating any particular theological doctrines, and it avoids broadcasting anything which might seem to assume functions that would properly belong to a church of any faith. When the Voice broadcasts church music, religious ceremonies, professions of faith or doctrines, or messages from clergymen, it does so as part of its reporting of an important facet of American life. Program materials include documentary reports and personal testimonies of the beliefs and works of great spiritual personalities or of movements which might edify or create good will among overseas listeners. The principle of freedom of religion implies that the Voice must avoid bias to any particular profession of religious belief. It is rather the function of VOA to unite people to protect all faiths.

Exposing Persecution Behind the Iron Curtain

Another function of the Voice of America is to tell about religious persecution behind the Iron Curtain, which, unhappily, shows no sign of abating. As long as such persecution exists, the world must be kept informed of the facts about it, for nothing shows more clearly the mendacity of the Kremlin's lip service to freedom of worship than the torture, mock trials, and murder of thousands of priests and ministers of all faiths. Where the Communists are in control, places of worship are converted into Communist meeting halls and militant atheism is taught in the youth organizations.

There is, however, a Communist pseudo deity. His name is Stalin. As Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr said in an interview for the Voice: "The real dan-

ger of communism is this false religion . . . which guarantees the Communists the right to manage history and their fellowmen. And the cruelty comes from idolatry." As Martin Luther put it: "You must not worry about people saying that they do not believe in God. You must worry about the false gods they do believe in." Where there is a spiritual vacuum, as in Communist countries, the false gods pour in.

The role of the Voice in the field of religion is to demonstrate to the world that the United States has a conscience toward mankind and that it is a nation under God. As a nation, the United States must understand the peoples of the world in order to communicate with them. To do this, it must fight against prejudice; it must strive for objectivity. The following prayer for the United Nations well represents the approach of the Voice of America in its handling of the religious phases of its activity:

Yet most of all, grant to us brotherhood, not only for this day but for all years—a brotherhood not of words but of acts and deeds. We are all of us children of the earth—grant us that simple knowledge. If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed. If they hunger, we hunger. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure. Grant us a common faith that man shall know bread and peace—that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, and equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our land but throughout the world.

•*Mr. Lyons, author of the above article, is director of Religious Programming of the International Broadcasting Service, International Information Administration.*

Trial of Bulgarian Catholic Clergy

Press release 822 dated October 20

The Bulgarian Government has just staged (Sept. 29-Oct. 3) another of its elaborate "trials" of religious leaders, designed, in this instance, to destroy the last remnants of the Catholic Church in Bulgaria. As in the infamous trials of Bulgarian Protestant leaders in the spring of 1949, the 40 Catholic leaders accused in this latest "trial" were charged with various vaguely defined anti-State activities, including, in the course of the proceedings, allegations that certain of the defendants had engaged in espionage as employees of "the Americans" and had for this purpose been in touch with a U.S. Government official on duty with the former American Legation in Sofia.

These charges are groundless and absurd. The same crude attempt to accuse the U.S. Government and its official representatives in Bulgaria of being involved in clandestine efforts to overthrow the Bulgarian Government has recurred in each of the many "trials" in which the Soviet satellite dictatorship in Bulgaria has sought to eradicate every form of opposition to its regime.

Cynical disregard for the truth characterized the whole "trial." At the end, the court dutifully meted out the sentences—four defendants, including one bishop to be shot, all but five of the rest sentenced for periods ranging from 10 to 20 years.

In a speech just prior to the trial, Bulgarian Minister of Interior Georgi Tsankov revealed with crude brutality the atmosphere in which the trial was to be staged. "Let all [who oppose the Communist regime] know," he said, "that the People's Rule, through the organs of the Ministry of Interior, is able to put everyone where he belongs, and will deal mercilessly with all who try to

hinder us. Neither God nor their imperialist masters can help them."

In accordance with this avowed policy, under the flimsiest pretense of legality, a last vestige of free religion in Bulgaria has now been stamped out. The Government of Bulgaria, which already stands accused before the tribunal of world opinion of the most blatant violations of its solemn obligation to guarantee human rights and fundamental freedoms to its citizens, has by this new act proved again how justly its vicious tyranny deserves the condemnation of free men everywhere.

The Free World Rediscovers Turkey

by Henry A. Byroade

Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs¹

It is indeed an honor to join with you in commemorating the twenty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Turkish Republic. It is furthermore a matter of personal pleasure. I have twice had the privilege of visiting Turkey. Once in 1947, I had a brief visit shortly after the United States had undertaken the task of assisting Turkey to defend herself against Soviet threats. The second trip was a more extended one, this spring after I had assumed my present position. Because of this latter interest, I was particularly keen to observe as much as I could.

Both times that I visited Turkey I was struck with the courteous hospitality with which we were greeted, the serious sense of responsible leadership and the firm loyalty of the Turkish people. Though my two visits were spaced only 5 years apart, I noticed many changes in the appearance of the cities. The trees which were relatively small in Ankara in 1947 were full of leaf in 1952, the city was a beehive of activity and growth. Ankara breathed a spirit of life and dignity. Istanbul also had put on a new dress in its parks, avenues, and well-constructed buildings. I have heard that this same phenomenon of bursting energy and life is apparent throughout the coun-

try. The visitor is impressed with the energy and confidence in their future expressed by the Turkish people.

There were certain impressions I gained on my visits which are confirmed by many guests who have had the opportunity of seeing Turkey. The feeling of "being at home" is one of these. Others express it in a different way by saying they feel they are "on firm ground" when they are working with Turks. Turkey and the United States have great differences in their geographical setting, in their historic background, and in language. It might be expected then that Americans would feel like strangers or ill at ease in the Turkish environment. But that is not the case.

One recent writer humorously remarked that Americans and Turks share certain characteristics and then lists them in this order—both Turks and Americans are erratic and naive, inexperienced and suspicious, but they also are enterprising and energetic, hospitable and generous. They both believe in opportunity for everybody, making education available to everyone, and have a sense of humor in common—they laugh at one another's jokes. The same writer then adds that Turkish taxi drivers like to argue with cops and that waiters in either country are equally bad.²

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the American-Turkish Society at New York on Oct. 29 (press release 835 dated Oct. 24).

² Reference here is to Joseph Wechsberg writing in the *New Yorker* of Oct. 4, 1952, p. 98.

U.S.-Turkish Possession of Common Traits

Perhaps we could stop with that list of common traits and argue that they were sufficient to account for the fact that over 4,000 Americans find a congenial climate in Turkish life and that perhaps as many Turks in the United States adjust with ease to our way of life. But I believe we can reduce the above miscellany of traits to a few of more fundamental value. I would like to make the attempt.

SIMILAR APPROACH TO PROBLEMS

1) The Turks seem to approach problems in a manner similar to our own. Most of my contacts with Turks have been associated with some form of planning. In 1947 the United States and Turkey were laying out long-range plans for the best use of U.S. military aid. We are now working on further plans for mutual security aid, for a Middle East defense organization, on NATO and other matters of mutual interest. Judged by the smoothness with which we are able to coordinate these complex plans, it becomes evident that there is great similarity in the way in which we "use our heads."

We equally evaluate the Soviet threat of aggression. We both agree our armed forces must be strong and ready to stop this aggression. We agree that this high level of military preparedness can only be supported by a higher level of national production. We both believe the greater effort demanded can only be generated by a free and informed citizenry. With agreement on these evaluations and assumptions, half the battle is won in drawing up plans to meet our mutual needs.

When in 1947 the President of the United States and the Congress made aid available to Turkey, we again found our rational processes paralleling one another. Most of this aid was to go directly to Turkish defense efforts, but a small part would be applied to a defense support plan which had certain economic advantages as well. The Turks alone could contribute the main components in the plan—the manpower, most of the local finances and matériel, leadership, morale, and courage. The United States could add some materials which had to come from abroad and some experience gained from the recent war. It was hard to find any important points of view on which we disagreed. Good planning and good execution have produced most satisfactory results. That the Turkish Army has attracted the attention of the free world is made obvious by the number of references one reads in the press of the other nations.

Gains in the economic sphere have been equally dramatic. Some newsmen complain that Turkey contributes no crisis news to the headlines. A journalist no more expects to be caught in a mob in Ankara than in Washington. Turks, like Americans, are too busy going about their business. They do not dissipate their reserves of strength

by emotional outbursts concerning events or causes far removed from their field of interest. So the reporter who expects to find stories of violent disturbances need not go to Turkey.

However, the reporter who expects to find a story of encouraging development should go there. Ever since 1923 when Kemal Ataturk assumed the leadership in Turkey, the country has developed an impetus worthy of note. When in 1947 the United States made available defense-support aid, there were no great differences of opinion or emphasis on how it might best be used. With Turkey contributing by far the greater share of the necessary requirements, the United States and Turkey have annually come up with a plan for joint co-operation. The results are most encouraging.

During the last few years the annual increase in Turkish gross national production has averaged, roughly, 7 percent. This is phenomenal anywhere. It is when this gross development is broken down into details that one gets a picture of what has released this outpouring of energy. The agricultural production of the country is rapidly being realized and the output in many categories is far above prewar levels. This increase is due in large measure to the energetic postwar program of mechanization and modernization. Modern farm machinery is bringing more land under cultivation. Technical advice extended under the ECA/Msa program is resulting in better methods not only in tilling the soil but in drainage, irrigation, use of insecticides, and so forth.

Supplementing this is the 9-year road program started in 1949 and involving the construction of around 23,000 kilometers of two-way, all-weather roads. This program is well over half done. Truck transportation is now available to many communities where the high costs of the camel caravan had made it impossible to get goods to the ports for shipment abroad. But thanks to the new roads, costs in interior areas for a ton-mile have fallen from one dollar to seven cents. That means the farmer living inland can grow crops and get them to the ports. The ports have been improved but the pressure of goods passing in and out have congested facilities. Warehouses have become inadequate to the demand.

From many reports we receive, it is clear that this is no accidental development, nor one related to only part of the Turkish people. It embraces every segment of Turkish life and has stimulated interior villages as well as urban centers to greater activity. It is also a further stage of development of the blueprint which the founder of Republican Turkey had in his mind when he started his revolutionary program 29 years ago. Such growth can only be possible where the people of a nation have confidence in themselves as well as in their future. This is a firm foundation on which to build national dignity and respect. It is the kind of an atmosphere which contributes to a healthy part-

nership anywhere. Both Turkey and the United States fortunately share in it.

RELATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE STATE

2) There is another factor in U.S.-Turkish relations that is part of the atmosphere which makes us feel at home in one another's society. We have common goals in the controversial matter of the relation of the individual to the state. One of the greatest battles of modern times is over the question of the organization of society. Not far from Turkey is the best illustration of a society which ignores completely any individual rights. The state makes all individuals its slaves. There are other societies where individualism is so strong that the state has no stability nor continuity.

The theme of the struggle to find a satisfactory balance between these two poles has marked Western civilization since the days of the Magna Charta. The same is true of the recent history of Turkey. In 1923 Turkey faced a very different set of facts than those which faced the United States in 1776; nevertheless, the Turkish Republic aimed at the same goals we had in mind. Starting from different points wide apart, we seem to be converging on a similar point of view as to the relationship of the individual to his national society.

Ataturk emphasized education and the freedom and participation of women in national life. He established the forms of government by which the individual would eventually be free to choose his own representatives and make his own laws. In spite of the drive of the Founder of the Republic, only a part of his blueprint had been implemented by 1938. It remained for his successors to build a superstructure upon this plan. Faithful to his vision, they have done well. There has been a healthy increase in freedom of political expression and in the latitude allowed a self-disciplined free citizenry.

In 1950, new strength was built into the structure of Republican Turkey. In a free and honest election, the citizens elected a new government. The former government, in a manner as dignified and mature as if this had always been the way in Turkey, turned over the reigns of authority.

In economic life, Turkey is also making healthy strides in giving the individual increased opportunity for initiative and effort. It is Ataturk's vision of an intelligent, independent, and intensely loyal citizenry which is coming into being that creates confidence in Turkey as it is now and as it will be in years ahead. It is no wonder that Americans and Turks have little difficulty in their mutual associations.

REASSESSING ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL WEALTH

3) There is a third feature common to our peoples and our history. The two Americas were discovered by various European explorers whose

successors quickly exploited the surface wealth of these two continents. As long as there were expanding boundaries, these colonizers paid scant attention to conserving the wealth of our land or to finding hidden resources. They left behind them partial devastation in the form of eroded lands, exhausted forests, depleted surface mines, and such institutions as slavery.

When territorial expansion came to an end, a new phase began in our history which might be called the Rediscovery of the United States. We have been forced to reassess our wealth. The assumption that a free citizen was a greater national asset than a slave brought about the end of slavery. We began to conserve our forests and harness our rivers, to save the soil and produce power, to dig deeper into our mines.

This Rediscovery of America has led to significant results in our national and international life. Areas partially abandoned a half century ago, because they were considered exhausted, are now teeming with industrial life and supporting a high level of cultural attainment. And in international affairs, this rediscovery of resources has made it possible for the United States to play an important role in discouraging the aggressive designs of totalitarian powers who would encroach on their free neighbors.

Turkey likewise has had a parallel experience. The early Turkish conquerors exploited the surface wealth of the lands they entered. The Ottoman Empire had an expanding frontier for centuries. It tended to ignore the genuine and permanent elements of national wealth at home and lived at the expense of its subject peoples. When the Ottoman Empire could no longer expand, its internal weaknesses increased in intensity.

Kemal Ataturk started the Rediscovery of Turkey. With severely reduced frontiers, he began to reassess the wealth of Turkey. He inspired a loyal, hardworking, and self-sacrificing citizenry to hold those frontiers and revealed an asset of the first magnitude. The world learned that the average Turk was capable of great courage, determination, patience, and self-sacrifice, and that Turks in general had a united will to survive. Conservation of this asset demanded the institution of health measures, a reorientation of town and village life, experimentation and intensification of scientific agriculture, the establishment of essential industries, and many other innovations. The Turks found that there were hidden resources scarcely touched by former generations. Mines were capable of greater production, soils could be more effectively used, rivers could be harnessed, and better communications could make goods available to internal and external markets. Education must be broadened and raised to higher levels.

While this program of the Rediscovery of Turkey was in process, the threat of totalitarian aggression loomed over the Turkish border. Ag-

gressors do not like the love of homeland by an independent people on their borders. Nor do they like to see progressive and creative growth in countries which they would like to penetrate.

It was then that the United States rediscovered Turkey. The characteristics shown by the Turkey of 1947 were those which strongly appealed to American sentiments. These characteristics were not only national assets to Turkey but to all free peoples who organized for peaceful purposes. Everyone knows the result. The United States offered to participate in a program for the strengthening of Turkey. I have already mentioned the successful development that occurred in the next 5 years. This rediscovery of Turkey's assets moved ahead early this year with the entry of Turkey into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The free world is learning that peace is not a negative abstract—merely the absence of war—but something positive and vital. It is something for which free men must work, especially when facing a great aggressive conspiracy like international communism. By the entrance of Turkey into NATO, a new area and a new force was added to those who have organized to build a peaceful world.

Turkey's Stabilizing Effect in the Middle East

Turkey, however, lies in a strategic location in the center of that long frontier from the China Sea to the Atlantic shores, where free peoples are taking positive steps to build up areas of strength against this cynical and unscrupulous conspiracy. As one of the sponsoring powers in the proposed Middle East defense organization, Turkey can and will play a constructive role in the stability of this very important area in the center of the line.

And when one goes to the extreme eastern end of this long line of struggle, there one finds a Turkish force taking its place in the U.N. Army throwing back the forces of destruction intent on destroying Korea.

So as the world of free men rediscovers Turkey, it finds that the concepts with which Republican Turkey is identified are laudable. They include plans for the enrichment of the meaning of life for the Turk at home and enlargement of the boundaries of freedom and stability abroad. Thus, the spirit of Republican Turkey has attained world significance. And much of this has occurred in the span of a single generation. Truly Turkey has packed centuries of experience into the past 29 years.

It is fortunate that the firm foundations on which Turkish-American relationships are based are not the monopoly of any one people—or nation. They are universal in potentiality. Turkey and the United States will find a congenial atmosphere of friendship wherever peoples or nations use their heads in calm judgment to solve their problems,

wherever the authority of the state rests upon the free choice of an intelligent and loyal citizenry, and wherever nations spend their energies on rediscovering the wealth that lies within themselves. The more such peoples and nations combine their spiritual and material strength, the greater is the hope for peace.

Commemoration of Czechoslovak Independence Day

White House press release dated October 25

The President on October 24 sent the following letter to Dr. Petr Zenkl, President of the Executive Committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, Washington, D.C.:

DEAR DR. ZENKL: You have asked on behalf of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia that October twenty-eighth of this year, the traditional Independence Day of Czechoslovakia, be remembered with words of encouragement to the suffering millions in your homeland who are faithful disciples of democracy.

The American Government and people note that this thirty-fourth anniversary of independence, formerly a national holiday, will pass unrecognized by the Government of Czechoslovakia for the first time since the Republic's founding. Even before such a departure the communists sought to subvert the day's meaning by attributing the success of the Czechoslovak independence movement of 1918 to the Soviet October Revolution of the preceding year. This patent deceit, so typical of the communist falsification of history, could not have impressed the great majority of the people of Czechoslovakia who are fully conscious of the close collaboration of Woodrow Wilson and Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder of the Republic, and the role played by the Allied Powers in its establishment.

The dark night of communist enslavement, bringing the loss of freedom, civil rights and human dignity, the corruption of the cultural heritage of the Czechs and Slovaks, and the repression of religious life, now unhappily covers your land. Yet this anniversary continues to symbolize the historic devotion of the people of Czechoslovakia to democratic and humanist ideals and the mutual bonds of friendship between them and the people of the United States. The twenty-eighth of October this year will be revered, however silently, by the forces of democracy inside Czechoslovakia who look forward to the day when their free institutions will be restored and the nightmare of communist dictatorship and exploitation be lifted from their land.

Outside, in the free world, this day will be commemorated with even more meaning than in the past, not only for its historic importance, but in

token of the deep concern and sympathy with which the Government and people of the United States and all free countries look upon the present plight of the people of Czechoslovakia. With other nations we are now in the midst of a great effort to build the common strength of all in the face of the Soviet menace. We are seeing to it that the people of Czechoslovakia are made aware of this joint effort and purpose, so that they may take heart and remain firm in these trying times, assured that the cause of truth and freedom will prevail.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN

Letter of Credence

Czechoslovakia

The newly appointed Ambassador of Czechoslovakia, Karel Petrzela, presented his credentials to the President on October 24. For text of the Ambassador's remarks and of the President's reply, see Department of State press release 837 of October 24.

Oil Imports and the U.S. Economy

by Robert H. S. Eakens

Chief, Petroleum Policy Staff¹

There is a broad framework within which we must deal with all of our problems. The civilized world of the West is challenged by an opposing philosophy which threatens our security, our freedom, our economic institutions, and our way of life. America must be vigorous and vigilant in protecting its national security. We have learned by now that we cannot live alone in the world and that our national security depends upon the economic strength, defense capacities, and good will and cooperation of the other countries in the free world, just as their national security is dependent upon us.

Therefore, to strengthen our national security and theirs, we have developed cooperative arrangements for defense such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the mutual security programs. These must be supplemented by such economic institutions as the International Bank and the Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, Point Four, and the U.S. Mobilization Program under the Defense Production Act.

One of the major objectives in this program for national security is the development of a strong and vigorous free-world economy which will sup-

port itself by its own production and trade without material or financial assistance from us. This takes time to develop, but such an economy is part of the bulwark we are constructing against aggression and against the danger from an alien philosophy which seeks to dominate all of us. It is in this context that we must develop all our foreign and domestic policies.

A major objective also in this program of developing strength to prevent aggression is the maintenance of a sound, productive domestic economy. We know that the United States is the arsenal of democracy and that it has achieved this position as a result of the ingenuity and enterprise of the American people. Those of us who are concerned with foreign affairs know that the strength of America in international relations is grounded on the strength of America at home.

We know that oil has an important place in this picture. There is a real appreciation of the importance of a healthy and expanding domestic oil industry, of its contribution in peacetime to all phases of our existence, and of its even more vital role in an emergency. It is inconceivable that any government agency which is faithful to its task would wish to do anything to impair the effectiveness or threaten the soundness of our petroleum industry.

It is against this broad background that I wish to discuss the place for imports in our oil economy. The oil industry long ago recognized, I believe, that there is a place for imports. The question that arises is whether that place shall, within certain broad limits, be left to the operation of competitive forces in the industry or whether it shall be defined in specific terms and new governmental controls instituted to enforce adherence to those terms. It is my impression that the oil industry has a long tradition of resistance to governmental controls or interference of any kind.

In this tradition, the National Petroleum Council, in 1949 in its statement of "A National Oil Policy for the United States," enunciated as a fundamental principle: "The public interest can best be served by a vigorous, competitive oil industry operating under the incentives of private enterprise." It seems to me that imports thus far have been left to find their place in a manner consistent with the traditions of the industry.

Safeguards Against Excessive Imports

There are, however, certain safeguards to prevent imports from becoming excessive as a result of concessions granted to foreign countries under the terms of a trade agreement. These safeguards operate both before a trade agreement has been negotiated and after it has become effective. Let me describe them briefly.

In the first place, the Government must consider what concessions it may offer to the other country. All available information is studied

¹ Address made before the Independent Petroleum Association of America at Oklahoma City, on Oct. 24 (press release 828 dated Oct. 22).

with the utmost care by such agencies as the Departments of the Treasury, Labor, Defense, Commerce, Interior, Agriculture, and State, and the Tariff Commission. Hearings are held at which interested parties may fully express their views.

After these hearings and studies, the agencies as a group recommend to the President what should be offered and sought. The concessions sought are important to various sectors of our own economy, and the President must decide before he accepts the recommendations that the proposed concessions would be of equivalent value on both sides. Thus, before a negotiation begins and before any concessions are offered, a very careful assessment of the impact of these concessions and of those sought in exchange is made, not solely by the State Department but by all interested government agencies. In case an agency dissents from the majority opinion, it must present its dissenting views to the President. There is a further safeguard which operates after a trade agreement has become effective.

If the Tariff Commission and the President conclude that the result of a concession has been the importation of goods in such quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products, the concession may be withdrawn. The President may also raise duties, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as the Tariff Commission finds to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the domestic industry. If the Tariff Commission recommends action along these lines and the President does not act within 60 days, he must submit a report to the appropriate committees of the Congress explaining why he has not done so. This procedure is the protection which any industry has against a flood of imports. You may or may not consider it adequate with respect to oil.

But assuming that you don't, is there in fact a serious prospect that oil imports will flood the U. S. market? In a report early this year which has been widely heralded by the industry as the most realistic oil report ever made by the Government, the President's Materials Policy Commission has provided an encouraging answer. You will recall that the Commission was given the task of studying the longer-range aspect of the Nation's materials problem. The Commission estimates that demand for petroleum in the United States in 1975 will total 13,700,000 barrels daily. Of this, the Commission estimates that domestic production will be able to supply 11,200,000 barrels, thereby leaving a net deficit of 2,500,000 barrels daily to be made up by imports. The Commission thus foresees an increase in domestic production between 1950 and 1975 of 5,290,000 barrels daily. This increase is equal to the growth of production that took place here in the United States from 1859 until 1947.

It is also interesting to take a look at what the

Commission thinks will happen outside of the United States, for those developments will determine the availability of oil for shipment to the United States. The Commission expects the requirements of the free nations, excluding the United States, to increase from 3,490,000 barrels daily in 1950 to 13,100,000 barrels daily in 1975. To supply this increase in demand and the 2½ million barrels daily of imports which the Commission says we will need, foreign production must be increased by 11,460,000 barrels daily. On the basis of the Commission's figures, expanding world consumption will thus offer tremendous scope for expansion of the oil industry both at home and abroad.

Supplementary Trade Agreement With Venezuela

For the best practical illustration of the place for imports, I believe we must take the case of Venezuela. Just a few days ago—on October 11—a supplementary trade agreement, which had been concluded with Venezuela on August 28, became effective.² I believe we find in that agreement, and in the reasons which led to its negotiation, examples of the contribution which imports can and should make.

I would like to take the most important reason for the negotiation of that agreement first—security. We all know that a strong and healthy domestic oil industry is our first line of defense. But also vital to us and to our allies is a strong and healthy oil industry in the rest of the free world. During World War II, Venezuelan oil exports reached a level of almost a million (956,000) barrels daily. This oil was available for the defense of the free world. It went into the common pool just as ours did. Even so, we all remember how short our supply was. We might not have had our 2 gallons without it. If we refuse Venezuela's exports and equitable opportunity to enter our market in peacetime, can we expect to have the needed supply of Venezuelan oil in an emergency?

My second point is that Venezuela sends us oil we need. Perhaps you would question whether higher-gravity crudes meet this test. That residual fuel oil and lower-gravity crudes do hardly seems open to question. Last year we consumed and exported 593,000,000 barrels of residual fuel oil. Our domestic supply was 475,000,000 barrels. The deficit of 118,000,000 barrels was made up by imports. Our supply is not sufficient to meet our requirements. And it is not economic for us to produce our requirements from our own resources.

Third, imports are essential if we are ever to be paid for the products we send abroad. We must

² For text, see BULLETIN of Sept. 29, 1952, p. 487; for an analysis of its provisions, see *ibid.*, Sept. 15, 1952, p. 400.

import unless we are prepared to continue giving our goods away. I am sure we all agree that this is true, although I know many people prefer to have the imports occur in the other fellow's industry. Whether or not the products of any particular industry are exported, all industries nevertheless have a major stake in an economy operating at a high level of employment and income. When our economy stagnates, few industries escape the consequences. Our foreign trade plays a crucial role in maintaining production, employment, and trade. It strengthens our bonds with the countries of the free world. It permits us and our friends to make the best use of manpower, resources, and productive facilities. Venezuela is one of our best customers in the Western Hemisphere. Last year, we shipped Venezuela some 456 million dollars in goods. About 60 percent of these goods is covered by revised concessions in the supplementary trade agreement. In addition, items such as insurance, profits on American investments, shipping, and other services make up an additional sum about as large. The latest figures for these items are for 1948, when they amounted to some 445 million dollars. Our direct and indirect purchases from Venezuela in 1951, consisting almost entirely of crude and fuel oil, on the other hand amounted to 488 million dollars. We thus sell to Venezuela roughly twice as much in goods and services as we buy. And there is no problem in obtaining payment in dollars. Unfortunately there are not enough markets like that.

There is one further point which I would like to make in regard to the supplementary trade agreement with Venezuela. Insofar as petroleum is concerned, the import duties under this agreement differ in only one respect from those provided for in the trade agreement with Mexico which was in effect from 1943 to 1950. The duty on crude and residual fuel oil of 25° A. P. I. gravity or above was set at 10½ cents per barrel, the Mexican agreement rate, and the duty on these products below 25° was set at 5¼ cents. This latter reduction, which was at a level below the rate in the Mexican agreement, was made only when it became evident that it represented the only possible way of concluding an agreement. Venezuela believed that on the basis of her long cooperation with the United States she was entitled to better terms than had been accorded Mexico in 1943. In your consideration of the agreement I ask you to bear these

facts in mind. I also ask you to bear in mind that the reduction to 5¼ cents per barrel was made only on those products which compete least with our own oil resources.

These are the reasons we entered into a supplementary trade agreement with Venezuela. I believe they illustrate the real place for oil imports in our economy. I believe the desirability of attempting to define that place in terms of specific quantities is open to serious question. To attempt to define it in this way and then to circumscribe it with new governmental controls would, I believe, be contrary to the traditions and interests of the industry. Moreover if imports are at all times to find their place and to perform their functions effectively, they must be flexible and responsive to the rapid changes in conditions in this country.

U.N. Staff Appointments

Press release 846 dated October 28

The Charter of the United Nations provides that the staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly. It also provides that the Secretary-General shall not seek or receive instructions from any government and enjoins member nations to respect the exclusively international character of his responsibilities. Accordingly, the U.S. Government does not attempt to instruct the Secretary-General as to whom he may employ or may not employ; it neither recommends U.S. citizens for employment nor gives loyalty or security clearance to those employed.

At the same time, the Department of State has made known to the Secretary-General its view that the employment of U.S. citizens who are Communists is not in the best interest of the United Nations, and the Department has long had assurance of the Secretary-General's agreement to this principle. Under a confidential arrangement with the Secretary-General, the Department of State, drawing upon its access to information held by the security agencies of the U.S. Government, has for some time been of assistance to the Secretary-General in identifying U.S. citizens, employed or contemplated for employment, who would appear to be Communists.

America's Responsibility in Today's World

by Howland H. Sargeant
Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs¹

I—like you—am concerned with education. I am concerned with keeping the American public informed on foreign-policy matters and in keeping the Department of State posted on what Americans are thinking about such matters. I am also concerned with the relationship between domestic public opinion and what we are telling people abroad through our international information and educational-exchange programs.

You are concerned with bringing a broad, basic education to young America and with the development of personality and character that this implies. The responsibilities of the teacher have always been considerable. I have often wondered whether or not our society fully recognizes the nature and extent of those responsibilities. One would doubt it if he were to judge solely by the salaries so many of our teachers receive.

But your responsibilities in today's world are perhaps greater than ever before. You are educating the future voters of America. You are educating the leaders who will pilot this democracy through what may well be an era of continued tension and difficulty.

There is a little story—one of my favorites—which bears directly on this question of educational responsibility. A grade school teacher was trying to convince her 7-year-olds that they should avoid overexposure to the winter cold. "Children," she said, "you must be careful about colds and overexposure. I had a darling little brother, only 7 years old. One day he went out into the snow with his new sled—and caught cold. Pneumonia set in and 3 days later he died." There was silence in the room for a few long seconds. Then a youngster in the back row raised his hand and asked, "Where's his sled?"

Humor aside—this points up a crucial fact. We do not always make the impression upon others that we think we are making or seek to make. In this kind of world, the United States must not

only make the best possible impression upon others. We must do everything to live up to those ideals which lead other people to respect us and to have confidence in our leadership. We must do everything to show others that their interest and ours coincide. There is no alternative if we are to be secure.

Communist Assault on Western Culture

Our support of the United Nations rests upon that conviction. It stems from the belief that we must have understanding among peoples if we are to have a peaceful world. To quote Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United Nations is "a place where political opinions of all kinds can be expressed in words, rather than bullets."

The ideals upon which the United Nations is founded are those upon which this America prospered and became great: freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual. They are the ideals of a good world society. Unfortunately, there are those who seek to frustrate those ideals. There are those who have done everything in their power to make aggression a synonym for peace and slavery a synonym for freedom.

International communism and its architects, the power-mad men of the Kremlin, threaten not only American security but every decent thing that Western civilization stands for. They have launched an all-out global assault on Western culture. And I use the term "culture" in its broadest sense.

To understand the nature of this assault, I think we need to know the enemy we face. I think we need to understand fully that the so-called Communist society of the U.S.S.R. rests upon deceit, distrust, and distortion.

Consider these evidences of Soviet culture. Few weeks pass when Moscow does not claim credit for inventing something which Western scientists developed generations before most Russians ever heard about it. During the past several years, the Soviets have claimed that Russians were

¹ Address made before the Colorado Federation of Teachers at Denver on Oct. 23 (press release 820).

the inventors of devices ranging from the first airplane to the first electric light. They even claim to have invented the great American pastime "beisbol." Apparently, Thomas Edison and the Wright brothers were mechanical pirates.

But the Soviets do not stop at stealing credit for the inventions of others. No, indeed. They are also past masters at rewriting history. They have rewritten the story of the role Stalin played in the Russian Revolution. In fact, they have done that rewrite job several times. They have doctored the history of their own Communist Party. They have carefully purged all of their school textbooks of any honest appraisal of the vast amount of material and other assistance the West gave the Soviet Union during World War II.

A small American contingent was part of a much larger Allied force which went into the Russian Far East during the closing months of World War I to guard rail and supply centers against the possibility of seizure by German troops. Early in 1951, Soviet propagandists suddenly "discovered" that these American soldiers committed wholesale atrocities against the Russian people. Ever since, these Soviet hucksters of hatred have been droning on and on about the tortures, the murders, and the rapes Americans are supposed to have inflicted upon the Russians.

A careful survey of Soviet publications in the period 1919 to 1950 reveals not a single word about these alleged atrocities. If anything, these publications treat the American role in World War I in almost heroic terms because of our success in encouraging other Allied troops to leave Russian soil after the war. The fact is that the Soviets decided to rewrite the history of American activities in Siberia because they believe the atrocity theme—false though it is—will help to develop hatred for America.

Soviet Hate Campaign

Most revealing as to the depths to which Soviet immorality has sunk is the manner in which the Communists are handling their young people. Youth is told, day in and day out, that they are expected to act as informers and stool pigeons—even to the denunciation of their own flesh and blood.

A youthful informer, one Pavlik Morosov, is literally a patron saint in the Soviet Union. Morosov has been commemorated in stone statues throughout the Soviet Union, and 2 years ago his picture graced a new issue of postage stamps. Morosov's fame rests upon his having informed on his own parents during the bloody Soviet collectivization drive of the early 1930's.

This, then, is the culture of the Soviet Union. This is Moscow, whose constant hymn of hate against America and Americans has portrayed us as "warmongers," "cannibals," "gangsters," and "rapers of innocent, defenseless women."

Insofar as the Kremlin is concerned, propaganda—lying propaganda—has long been the handmaiden of subversion, economic pressure, and aggression. Propaganda is but another of the Soviet's many tools for world conquest.

Soviet-inspired aggression in Korea was a threat to the United Nations, to America, and to the entire free world. So were the Communist efforts to subvert Greece. So were the attempts to drive the Western powers out of Berlin.

The current Soviet-propaganda campaign of hate against Western culture in general, and American in particular, is no less a threat.

Working together with our free-world allies, we stopped the Communists short in Korea, Greece, and Berlin. We must continue to stand together with equal determination if we are to meet the global psychological assault the Soviets have launched against us.

The recent Communist Party Congress in Moscow and what was said there may lead some people to believe that the Soviets have let up in their efforts to communize the world. There is no evidence to support this belief. Lenin taught that Communists must be prepared to execute a "zigzag" in tactics as long as they did not depart from their general strategy. At Moscow, Communist leaders appear to be doing just such a "zigzag" today in an effort to split the free-nation alliance. But their goal is still a communized world.

Unless we are prepared to continue to strengthen the moral and spiritual ties between ourselves and the rest of the free nations, our planes, our tanks, and our guns will mean relatively little. Unless we can maintain and improve our relations with the other peoples, we will have lost the global battle of ideas to the Soviets.

When I say that we must do everything possible to build understanding with others, I refer to people in all parts of the world. I mean the Far East and the Near East as well as Latin America and Western Europe. We must not forget the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain who have known freedom and who are thirsting for freedom's rebirth in their homelands. Nor can we forget the compelling reasons which led us to support the United Nations in Korea.

Importance of Stabilizing Europe

Those who assume that we can stand idly by while Communist imperialism swallows any part of the free world are deluding themselves. Every Soviet gain at the expense of free people is our loss.

However, I should like to talk for the most part about Western Europe—an area of vital importance to our Nation's security. Western Europe's importance to us is not only a matter of its industrial power, its skilled technicians, and its strategic position. Western Europe is, to a great extent, the cradle of our culture. Whether

we like it or not, we are the strapping child of a troubled parent. And the child needs the parent as much as the parent needs the child.

Now, I believe that the great majority of Americans understand this. But there are many Americans—even among those who do know free Europe's importance—who have become resentful of the Western Europeans. And that is understandable.

The American taxpayer has done his share to give aid to a Europe sorely in need of it. He sees his country carrying a greater share of the mutual-defense burden than any of its allies. He knows that America—the most powerful nation in the world and the power center of the free-world alliance—must do more if only because it is able to do more. But still he asks himself, "When are the Europeans going to get off our backs?"

Let us answer that query by taking a closer look at these Western European nations. The first point I would make is that great obstacles—many great obstacles—have been overcome in bringing about the existing mutual-defense system and the existing spirit of mutual cooperation which ties us to Western Europe.

The most obvious evidence here consists of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Schuman Plan, and the European Payments Union. Through NATO, we are working with the free Europeans in developing the military, economic, and moral strength with which to deter aggression and—if necessary—to repel it. The Schuman Plan, in providing a single, unified market for steel and coal in Western Europe, fosters both economic and defense stability. The European Payments Union acts as a financial clearinghouse and thus encourages freer trade.

These are concrete achievements—and all of them are vital to our own security as well as to Europe's. But not one of these achievements has become reality without considerable diplomatic pulling and hauling. Intense nationalistic feelings have had to be softened. Basic differences have had to be adjusted. The complexity of a Western Europe of many tongues and varying political and economic systems has had to be welded into a great team for defense of the free world. That the team was developed is—in no small part—due to our help. But it is primarily due to the efforts and the willingness of the Western Europeans themselves. We, in effect, helped them to help themselves.

It is then not a question of "getting the Europeans off our backs." It is a question of doing everything possible to work with the Europeans in building a stable group of free peoples who can stand on their own feet and resist any and all Communist encroachments. Understanding—mutual understanding—must be the foundation of these mutual efforts.

European Attitudes Toward U.S.

What sort of things condition European attitudes toward us? Let us look at the facts.

Most of the Western European peoples live at a material level far below our own. In many places, they have just begun to reach prewar levels. The rearmament effort, imposed upon these people by the threat of Soviet aggression, has added to an already existing economic strain.

Most of the Western Europeans lived on the field of battle during World War II. They saw their countries occupied, their cities and towns devastated, some of their greatest leaders shot as enemies of the Nazi state. They suffered to the full the degradation of the conquered. People who have been directly exposed to the horrors of modern war do not easily forget it.

Our status as the greatest power of the free world also conditions the way the Europeans look at us. Patriotic Europeans, whose pride in their nations equals our own, cannot be expected to fall headlong into love with a new superpower whose material strength and prestige surpasses their own.

A fourth very important factor is the feeling that—in the event of war—the Europeans would be directly in the path of destruction. America, from the European viewpoint, is less likely to suffer because of its distance from the center of Soviet power. This belief that Western Europe is running the greatest risk in the event of war is, I think, one of the greatest influences on European public opinion about the United States. These are only a few of the more obvious factors which affect the outlook of the peoples of the Western European nations.

Specifically, then, how do the great majority of Western Europeans feel about the United States? On the positive side, I think it can be said that most Western Europeans admire us for our technical know-how. They respect us for our material accomplishments. They look to us for support against aggression. Though there is some neutralist sentiment in Western Europe today, the great majority of Europeans earnestly believe that we are doing much more for peace than is the Soviet Union.

They appreciate what we have done to raise their standards of living through the Marshall Plan and other aid programs. They recognize America as the leader of the free-world coalition and look to us for continued material support and leadership.

But there are less favorable reactions which we must consider. For example, many Western Europeans have a marked fear of domination by the United States. They think that their dependence upon American material support may lead to the loss of their independence. Closely linked to this is the feeling that America is interfering in their domestic affairs.

Georges Bidault, former French Premier, referred to this feeling recently when he said: "It's only human . . . because America is too strong and rather impetuous. The French have the feeling that as soon as an idea emerges in the United States, it comes with such pressure that everyone is expected to yield to it immediately." Mr. Bidault is a long-time friend of the United States. His comment was made in the spirit of friendliness. It is safe to say that few men can equal Mr. Bidault's knowledge of his own people.

There are some Europeans who believe that the United States wants political and economic domination of the world. And I do not refer solely to the Communists when I say this. For the people who share this sentiment are of all shades of political opinion.

There is some tendency in Western Europe to question our judgment. And a considerable body of opinion holds that our rearmament program is increasing the danger of war.

The element of personal jealousy and dislike has been—to a great extent—fostered by on-the-spot reactions to well-paid GI's and free-spending American tourists. During World War II, these reactions were brought home rather sharply by the widespread comment that "Americans are overpaid, oversexed, and over here."

Then, of course, there is a strong feeling that the dollar sign is the truest expression of American culture. These, then, are some of the unfavorable attitudes with which we must cope in Western Europe.

You might well ask how it is possible for people to appreciate our economic and military aid on one hand and distrust our intentions on the other. We human beings are very complex. Our attitudes are often—to use an impressive technical word—"ambivalent." We can like and dislike the same person for exactly the same trait. Try that out on some of your immediate friends and neighbors. I think you will see what I mean.

If individuals react in this way to each other, just think of the problem faced in adjusting relations between entire peoples. It is tremendous.

Assaulting the Barriers to Understanding

But—insofar as the relations between ourselves and the Western Europeans are concerned—it is a problem that must be brought much closer to solution. Are we moving closer to that solution? Are we effectively assaulting the barriers to mutual understanding? Are we winning the "cold" war which the Communists have forced upon the world?

The answer to each of these questions is clearly "yes." Let me present some of the supporting evidence. Our International Information and Educational Exchange Program is using every available medium to get the truth about America to all areas of the world. We are combatting the "Big

Lie," which is basic to Soviet propaganda. We are working to show other peoples that their interests coincide with ours.

The results achieved through exchange of persons are typical of what we are accomplishing. American teachers, professors, students, journalists, and others are going overseas to visit, study, and learn about other ways of life. In the process, they also act as grass-roots ambassadors of ideas and good will for the United States.

Foreign leaders from all walks of life are visiting the United States and going away with a new or revised impression: "Americans are not barbarians after all."

There was the Asian labor leader who, after spending several months in this country, said—and I quote, "I have been highly impressed by the extent of individual freedom enjoyed by American citizens and by their inherent belief in the dignity of labor."

And there was the Dutch educator who set his impressions of America down on paper. This is what he wrote: "The arrogance with which people in Europe so often speak of American culture is by no means justified. . . . Films, press and radio often give us an unfavorable impression of American life but that impression is wrong and untrue. . . . People are convinced in America that one should make sacrifices for culture's sake."

So it goes. Slowly but surely, our Campaign of Truth is grinding away at the obstacles to mutual understanding between ourselves and our free-world neighbors.

But there are still other evidences of progress in the global battle we are waging against Communist ideology. There is the great decline in Communist strength which has taken place in Western Europe between 1946 and the present. In 1946 Communists held key posts in several of the Western European cabinets. Today, no Communist holds a cabinet post anywhere in Western Europe.

Membership in the Communist parties of Western Europe is down about one-third from what it was in 1946. Communist-controlled unions, including the powerful ones in France and Italy, have lost both membership and influence among the general population. Circulation of Communist Party publications has fallen off. For example, the circulation of the major French Communist organ has dropped from 600,000 in 1946 to 200,000 in 1951.

The number of Communists holding seats in the parliaments of Western Europe has dropped drastically since 1945. In France, the number of Communist-held seats went from 181 in 1946 to 103 in 1951. In the Netherlands, the drop was from 10 to 8. In Belgium, the decline was from 23 to 7.

Incidentally, Belgium held nation-wide municipal elections less than 2 weeks ago. In Brussels, the Belgian capital, the Communist popular vote dropped 60 percent from what it was in 1946. The

estimated drop in the Communist popular vote for the country as a whole was 50 percent.

There are no Communists at all in the parliaments of Great Britain and Norway today. I might add that—in both of these countries—there is a very strong labor party in the legislature.

That, it seems to me, is one of the best possible answers to those few die-hards who chronically associate labor with communism. The record shows that free labor in general and American labor in particular has been in the forefront of the battle against communism. The record shows that America's labor unions are not only fighting communism here at home. They have joined with the free labor unions of other nations to fight communism on a global basis.

Still another type of evidence as to the advances freedom is making at the expense of communism may be found in the number of defectors fleeing into Western Europe from behind the Iron Curtain. The stream of escapees continues to flow steadily despite the terror tactics the Communists are using to try to halt it. In Germany alone, the number of Germans who escape from the Soviet zone averages between 600 and 700 a day.

The almost paranoiac insecurity which the Soviets themselves exhibit is further evidence of the progress we are making in combatting Communist ideology. At the present time, something very close to a purge is going on among Soviet Communist Party officials. The Party is busy expelling what a top Politburo member has referred to as "opportunists, deviationists, bourgeois nationalists and other undesirable elements." That is Communist double-talk for "people who cannot be trusted by the Party leaders."

It is true, of course, that the purge is a regular pastime among the Communists. It is fully in line with the terrorism and deceit by which Communist governments regularly seek to keep their enslaved peoples in line. But the purge—the current one in the Soviet Union included—is particularly significant because it reflects a fear and an insecurity in large part due to the pressure of external forces. The ideal of freedom is certainly one of the most important of those forces.

These, then, are some of the evidences which testify to our effectiveness in the field of ideas. We are penetrating the armor of propaganda behind which the Communists are seeking to hide their true motives. We are building understanding with other free peoples.

But—and again we must be absolutely frank—the job has really just begun. Our current Government information program is doing much. But that peacetime program is only about 7 years old. You cannot change the attitudes and habit patterns of generations overnight.

Furthermore, our Government information program is but one of America's many, many voices. We are not like the Soviet Union which speaks with but one voice—the voice of Stalin's dictator-

ship. The United States, like any democracy, makes itself known abroad through the student, the tourist, the visiting professor, the soldier, the free press, radio, and motion pictures—as well as through its Government spokesmen.

U.S. Speaks with Many Voices

Where the Soviet Union speaks with but one opinion, we speak with many. To try to do otherwise would be to impose upon ourselves the very totalitarianism we are struggling to avoid.

It is clear, then, that the burden of cementing our psychological unity with the free peoples whose friendship we must have falls heavily upon private groups and individuals. It falls upon the shoulders of Americans as a people whose actions speak as loudly as words. It falls particularly heavily upon you—the educators of America.

We Americans must not only permit others to see us as we are. We must convince them that we stand for something which it is to their advantage to share. We must convince them that we desire their confidence and respect, that we are interested in their welfare, and that they can better themselves by working with us.

We must show them that the American way is the way of dynamic, democratic progress—that ours is the true revolution which can guarantee all men freedom of spirit and equality of opportunity. We must show them that the revolution of which the Communists prate is really a dark reactionary conspiracy and the complete suppression of individuality.

Simply being against something will get us nowhere. We must be for something good, decent, and just. We must be prepared to accept criticism, good or bad. And we must be willing to right the wrongs that others detect in us.

I have already commented on your great responsibility in this trying period of our Nation's existence. I should like to reiterate that that responsibility goes far beyond teaching the fundamentals of reading, writing, and arithmetic. It goes far beyond providing a general background in the physical and social sciences.

You are engaged in molding young America. The sort of person that Mrs. Jones' little boy will be as an adult is becoming increasingly dependent upon the classroom. The sensitivities, the attitudes, the habit patterns of youth—more and more you are sharing their development with the parents and the home. The principles we live by—political, economic, and social—these too you teach the youth of America.

In this connection, I want to stress the need for giving American youth a chance to learn the difference between true patriotism and its obnoxious counterfeits. In these times, an honest, unflinching patriotism is absolutely vital to our Nation's security. Youth must understand that the true patriot is not one who spends his time preaching

hatred and distrust for all who disagree with him. The true patriot does not brand every idea which he does not want to accept as either "Communistic" or "Fascistic."

The true patriot does not stoop to the nefarious smear tactics which the Communists themselves have made routine. The genuine patriot has positive convictions about American democracy. He is confident in its staying power. He is tolerant of ideas with which he himself may not agree as long as it is clear that those ideas do not threaten the structure of democracy. The true patriot understands that democracy is sufficiently strong to withstand any alien ideology if only democracy is given a chance to function.

Surely, you can see—you must see—that much of the future of America lies in your hands. Our chances for building secure relationships for this Nation tomorrow rest—to a great extent—upon what you do today. For you are engaged in helping to create the image of America that other peoples will see and come to know in the future. I have every confidence that you will continue to do your share to make that image an honest reflection of a sound, a strong, and an understanding America.

Propaganda Attacks on U. N. and UNESCO

by Perle Mesta
Minister to Luxembourg¹

The fight you are making for better understanding between peoples—for peace—is ours. The goals you seek belong to all of us. It seems to me that the most important thing I can say to you is to make you understand how very deeply we feel this. To, perhaps, bring you a message of hope and encouragement from one of those back of the firing line.

When I think of the responsibility that is yours I am, frankly, awed. The responsibility and the opportunity both are tremendous.

I have no doubt that you can handle this responsibility. You have in the past. I am equally sure that you will rise to the opportunity before you.

In your hands lies the future—the future of not only America but of the world. For, whether we like it or not, the future of the United States and all mankind are today irrevocably linked. And the future of the United States lies with its youth—the boys and girls in your classrooms. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the teachers of America. You are doing and have

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the Oklahoma Education Association at Oklahoma City on Oct. 31 (press release 831 dated Oct. 23).

done a splendid job. And with, I regret to say, very little reward other than the satisfaction of a job—a worth-while job—well done.

That job is, of course, complicated by the attacks under which many of you are now suffering—unjust attacks. I refer specifically to the attacks upon your efforts to teach the facts about today's world. To give your students understanding of the free world's effort to build peace through the United Nations.

The Enemy's Character in the War of Ideas

The man on the Korean front has, at least, this advantage. He has little trouble in identifying his enemy. The gun in that enemy's hand is visible. The situation has clarity.

In this war of ideas the enemy is not wearing a uniform. His weapons are of the mind and can be identified only by the mind. He fights with ideas, and often these ideas are purposely confused.

In their campaign for power, world power, total power, the masters of the Kremlin have very clearly recognized that this is, basically, a war for the minds of men. They are backing up that war militarily and economically, but fundamentally the victory will be won or lost on the ideological front.

They recognize fully the potency of the idea of peace, and they have seized on that idea subverting it to their own ends just as they have tried to do with the idea of democracy, with the idea of freedom and the whole long list with which they have, and can have, no sympathy.

The mockery of the Soviet "peace" crusade is almost unbelievable. They talk "peace" while threatening the world with war—with World War III.

They have resorted to the most callous exploitation of mankind's deep longing for peace. Their propaganda machine is geared to a program of undermining the morale of the democratic peoples by the most monstrous lie ever invented—that the United States and its allies seek war while the Soviet Union and its satellites want only peace.

William Foster, chairman of the Communist Party in the United States, opened the Moscow peace campaign in this country in a key speech in March 1950. Foster called the Communists' "peace" crusade their "most decisive political task." Every Communist organization, every club, every section, he said, must have a plan for this peace—this phony peace.

These tactics have enlisted in the crusade all of the Communists, American brand, and their sympathizers. That was to be expected. I am not going to discuss them.

The groups who really distress me are those who ignorantly play the Soviet game—who do not

realize that their activities are directed toward achieving the Soviet objectives.

You teachers have become the special target of certain individuals and certain groups. Why? Well, because you have so responsible and important a job in this fight. Because you are, indeed, on the front line.

Take the attacks on your discussions of the United Nations and UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) in your classrooms. To anyone familiar with Soviet strategy the *why* of these attacks is all too clear. To date, the United Nations has been one of the greatest obstacles in the path of Soviet ambitions. Korea is a case in point.

The United Nations seeks peace—a real peace. UNESCO proposes to build a foundation of understanding for that peace—understanding between nations and between people.

The Soviets would like to see these efforts fail. They are working actively everywhere in the world to make them fail.

A Grand Prize for the Soviets—An Isolated America

Let me repeat, I do not for one moment think that all the groups and individuals in this country criticizing the United Nations and UNESCO are knowingly working for the Communists. On the contrary, many of them are rabid anti-Communists. They fear and dread Soviet imperialism as deeply and sincerely as you or I. Yet they are playing the Soviet game. They are seeking to destroy the united world front against Soviet communism. They would, for one thing, give the Soviets the grand prize—an isolated America.

Listen to this:

Having come under the thumb of the American imperialists this humanitarian organization (UNESCO) endeavors to divert the masses by false talk about universal respect for justice and the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

And who is that talking? The Soviet-controlled *New Times* of Moscow on March 20, 1950. Just about the time the famous "peace" crusade was launched.

Again: "UNESCO is sparing no effort in spreading the reactionary ideology of the United States." This was a message beamed from Moscow to Turkey on May 5 of this year.

Daily the Soviet press, the Soviet radio, all their weapons of ideological warfare, din this thesis into the ears and minds of men and women in every area of the world. UNESCO must be destroyed. Its work must be rendered futile.

But let us put on another record.

"UNESCO is a movement far more dangerous than communism," asserted an officer of a well-known Pacific Coast women's organization in a recent radio broadcast. "We are gradually being taken over by UNESCO to put our minds in chains," declared another well-known American club

woman, the former head of one of our greatest patriotic women's organizations.

On October 18, 1951, a highly distinguished member of the U.S. Congress attacked UNESCO on the floor of the House of Representatives as "the greatest subversive plot in history."

Attacks on the United Nations and UNESCO are, in many instances, closely related to attacks on schools. This is not a coincidence because UNESCO stands for many of the same things that our schools stand for—freedom of information, access to facts, independence of thought. And so UNESCO is labeled a greater danger than communism—as subversive, as an instrument to put chains on the minds of our youth.

The voice is Jacob's voice, my friends, but the hands are the hands of Esau.

Actually, you know, the U.S.S.R. has never been a member of UNESCO. They have never even applied for membership. Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary belong but take very little part in UNESCO's activities. Their delegates walked out when UNESCO refused to seat Communist China in place of representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government.

The Soviets do belong, of course, to the United Nations, and their efforts always have been to prevent unity and unified action. Whatever the United Nations has accomplished—and its accomplishments have been substantial—has been in the face of Soviet obstruction, and this very obstruction in the United Nations has served to awaken many nations of the free world to the true nature of Soviet policy.

But I do not believe I need defend either the United Nations or UNESCO to you. I can only warn you to be constantly on the alert in your schools and in your communities to identify both the voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau.

Keeping Open the Minds of Tomorrow

Your great task is to keep the minds of tomorrow open. Not long ago I was reading a very interesting article by H. A. Overstreet. Some of you may have seen it. In the course of a discussion of the political ideology of totalitarianism, Mr. Overstreet said:

Totalitarianism of whatever sort—religious, political, economic, educational—is a plan for fixating the many in immaturity. It is a plan for preventing the majority of men and women from growing up.

Those who would limit discussion in your schoolrooms would do just that. They would put a stop to growth; they would "fixate the many in immaturity."

Continued Mr. Overstreet:

Political totalitarianism comes with Plan in hand. To its own passionate belief, it has the way, the truth, and the light. It announces to the world it has the sole way of human salvation. All the other ways are of the Devil—capitalism, liberalism, democracy. With complete assur-

ance of rightness, it calls for an utter surrender and obedience.

Under communism, education has been shaped to fit this pattern.

Those who would force this pattern upon American education have, I feel, no faith in democracy. They have no faith in man. The peace we seek will come only through a faith in man. It can come only through understanding—mature understanding. If you, our teachers, teach the coming generations to think, you will have helped to make that peace sure.

Throughout the ages the thinkers of all nations, of all peoples, have recognized the futility, the stupidity of war. They have seen that the brotherhood of man is not merely a beautiful but unattainable ideal, but a fact. And it is a fact we must recognize if we are to survive.

We, however, must have patience. We can't win this fight overnight. Patience and courage. It has taken great courage for you, our teachers, to stand up under the attacks leveled at you and to continue with your great task. That you have so stood is a matter of pride for all Americans.

Obviously, whatever you do will be limited in its effect unless your communities back you. Education that stops when the children leave the schoolroom will never be very effective. Most of you, I know, are working in your communities, and the majority of your communities, I am sure, support you.

The American people have, I think, grown up tremendously in these past few years. Responsibility breeds responsibility. As we have, of a necessity, taken on world responsibilities, we have developed the maturity it takes to handle our new tasks.

Additional Fees on Imported Filberts Found Unjustified

Statement by the President

White House press release dated October 20

On September 25 I received from the Tariff Commission a report and recommendation with respect to additional fees on imports of almonds and an import quota on shelled filberts. I accepted the recommendation with respect to almonds and issued a proclamation in time for it to be effective on October 1.¹ The matter of filberts was left for further consideration.

Since that time I have found no need for the imposition of a quota limitation on imports of shelled filberts, and I therefore am taking no action to impose new restrictions on imports of filberts for the coming crop year. My decision is based on several facts. One of these is that American growers seem assured of a return from their

in-shell sales alone, in excess of their returns from their entire crop last year. I can find no justification for the belief expressed in the report that there is, or is likely to be, so severe a threat to American filberts as to warrant the imposition of an import quota.

Restrictive action with regard to filberts would fall almost entirely upon Turkey and would reduce its annual dollar earnings by over one and one-half million dollars. This would be on top of a loss of dollar earnings already incurred by reason of an increased tariff on dried figs.² Imposition of the recommended quota would seriously interfere with the emergency efforts to combat the serious Turkish financial crisis.

Point Four Director for Liberia

Press release 830 dated October 23

John W. Davis, president of West Virginia State College and an outstanding American educator, has been named U.S. Director of Technical Cooperation in Liberia, the Department of State announced on October 23.

Mr. Davis will have charge of the Point Four Program of technical cooperation in Liberia under the general direction of Ambassador Edward R. Dudley. He will succeed C. Reed Hill, who was transferred from Monrovia to Washington to become chief of the Liberian Branch of the Technical Cooperation Administration. At present 84 American technicians are in Liberia, assisting in its country-wide development program. Several Liberian trainees are studying in the United States under the auspices of Point Four. The United States and Liberia signed a general Point Four agreement on December 22, 1950.

Cooperative activities in economic development in Liberia are among the most extensive of any under the Point Four Program, which is now operating in 35 countries. During the current fiscal year the Liberian Government is contributing 20 percent of its total national revenue, or about \$1,400,000, toward the cost of the program. The United States is contributing \$1,500,000.

In addition to direct contributions, the Liberian Government expends considerable sums of its own revenue toward cost of capital-development projects on which U.S. technicians are assisting. The Liberian Government also is spending \$6,330,000 of Export-Import Bank loan funds to accelerate the economic development of the country.

A joint commission for economic development, composed of seven Liberians and six Americans, surveys the economic resources of the country and plans and assists in carrying out the Liberian Government's 5-year development plan, in which Point Four is playing an important, coordinated role.

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 13, 1952, p. 569.

² *Ibid.*, Sept. 1, 1952, p. 337.

The Prisoner Question and Peace in Korea

Statement by Secretary Acheson¹

U.S./U.N. press release dated Oct. 24 [Excerpt]

Let us talk for a moment about the background of the prisoner question. From the very beginning the United Nations Command has followed the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949, and it has particularly done so by promptly sending lists of prisoners to the International Committee of the Red Cross, which, in turn, has sent these lists to the other side. Vast numbers of prisoners have been captured by the United Nations side. One hundred and seventy thousand odd names were sent in. Subsequently, it was discovered that during the period of the wholesale surrenders by the North Korean Army and the mass movement of refugees from the North, 37,000 odd people were sent into these prisoner-of-war camps who were not prisoners at all. These were civilian people, and they were reclassified—some 37,000 odd people—and they were set free. The International Committee of the Red Cross was informed of the people by name. Subsequently, we gave a revised list to the Communists containing 132,000 names. Investigation of those revealed that an additional 11,000 were Republic of Korea citizens who were not properly classified as prisoners of war, and they too are being released. The United Nations Command, therefore, has in custody as prisoners of war about 121,000 persons.

As compared with what I have just reported as to United Nations observance of the Geneva Convention, the Communist practice has been not to inform the International Committee of the Red Cross or the United Nations Command, through any channel, of the names and numbers of prisoners of war, as required by law. When they finally

agreed to list the prisoners of war, they listed 11,500, including all Koreans and all United Nations Command prisoners. This was disappointing because, only months before, on April 8, 1951—and before that, on February 9, 1951—the Communists had announced over the radio that, in the first 9 months of hostilities, they had captured 65,000 persons. They were very proud of it, and they announced it over the radio twice—65,000 prisoners in the first 9 months of hostilities. But, when they were asked about the difference between 65,000 and 11,500, they had a most interesting explanation. They said that the difference was accounted for by people who had been “reeducated” at the front—so quickly that it was impossible to get their names. Most of these people had almost instantaneously been reeducated—and had done what? What do you suppose these reeducates had done so quickly that one could not get their names? You have guessed it, I am sure: they joined the North Korean Army. And that was the difference between 65,000 and 11,500.

In the treatment of prisoners of war, the United Nations Command has not only sent the lists, but it has admitted the International Committee of the Red Cross to its prisoner-of-war camps; it has given that Committee every facility to investigate every camp; and, on every occasion on which it has been criticized by the International Committee for any conduct, it has promptly met that criticism and changed what was going on in the camp.

Communist practice, as I have said, has been that they have not given lists of names. They have failed to appoint a protecting power or a benevolent organization such as the Red Cross. They rejected the efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross to get into the Communist prisoner-of-war camps. They have refused to exchange relief packages, and, until very recently, they have refused to exchange mail—and now that is allowed only on a most limited scale. They have refused to report on the health of prisoners of war, and they refuse to exchange the seriously

¹ This review of the prisoner-of-war question constituted the last portion of the Secretary's report on the Korean problem in Committee I (Political and Security) of the U.N. General Assembly on Oct. 24. For excerpts from the preceding portions, which trace the history of Korea from the Cairo Conference in 1943 to the current recess in the armistice negotiations, see BULLETIN of Nov. 3, 1952, pp. 679-692. The complete text is printed as *The Problem of Peace in Korea*, Department of State publication 4771.

sick and wounded, as is required by the Geneva Convention. They have failed to give the accurate locations of the prisoner-of-war camps, and they have failed to mark them properly. And they have situated their camps in places of danger near legitimate military targets, in defiance of the Geneva Convention.

The Repatriation Question

We now come to the origin of this repatriation question. As increasing numbers of prisoners came into United Nations hands, it began to be found out that more and more of these prisoners believed that, if they were returned to Communist hands, they would be executed or imprisoned or treated brutally in some way. They therefore took the position that they would not be exchanged and that, if an attempt was made to exchange them, they would resist by force. It was quite unthinkable to the United Nations Command that it should use force to drive into the hands of the Communists people who would be resisting that effort by force. That was the attitude taken by the United Nations Command. It was the attitude taken by all other governments whose troops were in Korea and who would be required to carry out this forcible return if it were instituted. So far as I know, there has been no member of the United Nations outside the Communist group that has ever suggested that it was right, proper, legal, or necessary to return these prisoners by force.

Even our knowledge that many of the prisoners had this attitude did not give us the slightest idea of the magnitude of the problem until the interrogation period came along in April 1952. At that time, when we saw the numbers who held these views and the violence with which they held them, it became clear that it would not only be highly immoral and illegal to force these prisoners to return but that it would also require a military operation of no inconsiderable proportions to do it.

Let us be clear about the attitudes and positions which have been taken. Early in the negotiations and throughout the negotiations, the United Nations Command has taken the view that all prisoners in its possession were entitled to the opportunity to be repatriated. There is no question about that. Every one of them is entitled to it—the entire 121,000—even though the result of an exchange of that magnitude would be that prisoners being returned to the United Nations Command would number 11,500, while these others would come to a vastly greater number. Our point is that the prisoners are entitled to an opportunity to be repatriated, and we have never departed from that view after the early days of the discussion. And what we have tried to do throughout these discussions is to be as ingenious as possible in finding ways of meeting the Communist objections.

Now let me talk for a moment about the so-called

screening of prisoners, which really means the interrogating of the prisoners to find out whether or not they would resist violently a return to the Communist side. It is important to note that, in seeking a solution of this problem, a principal step involved finding out what the prisoners thought, whether or not they would resist by force. The Communists have always claimed that it was wrong to find that out—that that was a wrong thing to do. And yet, what I would rather stress here is that the screening was done with their knowledge and with their acquiescence. Now, how did that come about? It came about in this way: In April 1952, when we were arguing with the Communists as to this principle, they said: "Well, how many people are involved in this? Let us find out whether this is a serious question before we just argue about it on principle. How many of these prisoners do you say would violently resist going back?" And we said: "The only way we can find out is to ask them. We don't know any other way of finding out. And we think it would be very helpful and very much to your interests on the Communist side if you put out a proclamation of amnesty, so that we could tell anybody who was worried about himself that you are ready to pardon him." The Communists said: "That is a good idea; we will do that." And so they put out a proclamation of amnesty for any prisoner of war who would return—for the very purpose of affecting, if they could, the decision of the prisoners in this period of interrogation. Therefore, when they say that this is all wrong and wicked and illegal, what you have to know is that they themselves agreed to it.

We tried to be as careful and as fair in the screening as we possibly could. In order to achieve that, the interrogation of the Chinese prisoners of war was done exclusively by United States military personnel; there were no Chinese personnel used in that operation. In the case of the Koreans, it was very largely United States military personnel, but in some cases others assisted.

Also I wish to stress that the prisoners were encouraged to agree to repatriation. A prisoner who does not want to go back is a problem. It is not something one wants to happen; it is something one does not want to happen. Therefore, they were encouraged to agree to repatriation. They were warned of the possible ill effects which might result to their families in the Communist area if they did not return. They were told that no promises would be made to them about their future, and if there was any doubt whether a prisoner was going to resist or not, we put him in the group which had agreed to return home. It was only when those who carried on the interrogation were convinced that the prisoner would violently resist—not just argue about it but violently resist—repatriation that the prisoner was classified as not available for repatriation.

The original screening of prisoners of war in April applied only to those who were in camps where this interrogation was permitted. In some of the camps the Communist leaders of the prisoners refused to permit any interrogations, and such interrogations were not possible until later. Thus, the first results were that 70,000 would be available for repatriation. In most camps where we could not carry on an interrogation, we had to estimate, and that was done on the basis that most of these prisoners would want to return. Therefore, we reported that there were 70,000 who would be available for repatriation.

Even in the camps where the Communist leaders were in complete control and where no interrogation was permitted, a thousand prisoners escaped at the earliest possible moment to get away from these leaders, and a considerable number who attempted to escape were murdered by their own fellow Communist prisoners of war.

Subsequently, the United Nations Command completed the interviewing of all those who had not been screened previously and reported that 83,000 wished to be repatriated. This number was made up of 76,600 Koreans and 6,400 Chinese. They were the ones who said they would not violently resist repatriation.

But let me say here, as we have said over and over again, that the United Nations is willing to have all this screening redone by any impartial body in the world. We have made that offer over and over again. The Command has done the best it can, but it does not set itself up as final and absolute, and if any other group of people acceptable to all and whose word would be taken could do that screening, then let them do it by all means.

The first results when these figures were announced were that the Communist leaders inspired disturbances at the Koje camps for the purpose of discrediting the United Nations Command and the interrogation. These were very disagreeable affairs. Order was finally restored by the use of the minimum force necessary, but force was necessary to restore order and discipline.

Now let us look for a moment at this repatriation question in connection with international law and international practice, because you will hear it shouted out violently around this room, as it has been at Panmunjom, that under international law it is necessary that these prisoners shall be forcibly returned to their own side. Is that true? Let us find out whether it is true. The Communists have insisted that the prisoner must be returned, regardless of his own attitude. They have also said that, in fact, all the prisoners do want to return to the Communist side, but that it is only the imperialistic warmongers who are keeping them. Finally, they say that the Geneva Convention and international practice require this forcible repatriation. We, on the other hand, have said that we have lived up to the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Convention. We have said that we have abided by them and will

abide by them and that our position on repatriation is wholly consistent with that convention.

Provisions of the Geneva Convention

Let us see whether that is correct. The Geneva Convention has many provisions about the repatriation of prisoners. Some of these provisions deal with prisoners who are sick or wounded or who, for one reason or another, are out of the fight. Other provisions deal with the repatriation of prisoners at the end of hostilities. All the provisions have one purpose, and their language is directed to that. They say that, subject to special agreements which do not derogate from the rights of prisoners, and certainly the special agreement we are talking about here does not derogate from his rights but increases his rights, the prisoner shall be released and repatriated if he is sick and it is established that he is out of the battle. As to the others, that shall be done at the end of hostilities. What is the purpose of this? These people who are prisoners of war have been captured by force and are being held by force out of the conflict. They are no longer participating in the war, and the purpose of the convention is that when it is clearly established that the prisoner is out because physically he cannot get back into it, or when the hostilities themselves are over, then he can be set free and sent home. That is entirely the proper thing to do, and that is the purpose of this convention. The ordinary presumption, and the presumption which is true in a large number of cases, is that the prisoner wants to go home. That is where he came from, and he wants to go back there.

But what the convention gives here is the opportunity to go home. It is the right and the opportunity which is given by the treaty. The Committee does not have to take my word, because the United Nations has voted upon it. This is the interpretation put upon this treaty by the General Assembly of the United Nations. On December 14, 1950, the General Assembly adopted resolution 427 (V). That resolution concerned prisoners of war from the Second World War, many of which, it was alleged, were being detained in the Soviet Union. That is, French prisoners, German prisoners, and Japanese prisoners were being held in the Soviet Union and not allowed to go home. The resolution called upon all states to abide by international law and conventions, and it particularly referred to the Geneva Convention of 1949 and urged that that should be obeyed by everyone. What does the resolution say about it? All governments still having control of such persons were called upon—

to act in conformity with the recognized standards of international conduct and with the above-mentioned international agreements and conventions which require that, upon the cessation of active hostilities, all prisoners should, with the least possible delay, be given an unrestricted opportunity of repatriation . . .

The phrase "above-mentioned international agreements and conventions" referred to the Geneva Convention of 1949. That is the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, made at a time when this particular controversy was not raging. It stated the universally accepted meaning of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

Is there anything in the convention which would lead one to believe that a prisoner of war must be forced at the end of a bayonet, fighting, perhaps dying, to go back when he does not want to go?

Is there anything in the treaty? I assure you there is not. You will search the treaty in vain for any such provision. I also assure you that this matter was discussed when the 1949 convention was being negotiated. This precise question was talked about, and it came up in this way. The question being discussed was whether the previous international law, the existing, recognized international practice should be enlarged—not whether it should be narrowed but whether it should be enlarged. There were delegates present who claimed that it should be enlarged and that the prisoner of war should have an absolute right to stay, if he wanted to, in the detaining state. The detaining states said no; that had never been the case before. The situation before had been that if the prisoner claimed asylum, and if the detaining state believed that that claim was honest and bona fide—if it believed that in making that claim the prisoner did not just want to change his residence because he liked the climate or because he had fallen in love with somebody or something of that sort—then the detaining state could permit him to remain. But those states said that they could not agree to accept a kind of immigration which would mean that a prisoner could become a citizen and a permanent resident just because he happened to like them. That was not right at all.

After discussion it was decided to reject the new proposal, and what remained was the existing practice, namely, that a detaining state retains discretion as to whether it shall honor a claim for asylum or not. It may, of course, exercise that right; it would be unthinkable for anything else to be the case. Therefore, the international practice was maintained in the treaty as it had been before.

What was this international practice? It is just what I have said: If a prisoner believed that it was dangerous for him, that he might die if he were sent home, and if he claimed asylum, and if the detaining state thought that it was an honest, bona fide claim, the detaining state could grant asylum. That was the practice.

I will not take up the time of the Committee by going over all the instances in which this principle has been applied, but it is rather interesting to direct our minds to a few instances, and I have chosen for the purpose some treaties entered into by the Soviet Union, because they are the loudest in screaming that this is quite illegal, wholly

wrong, and has never been engaged in before and that it is an imperialist warmonger's idea dreamed up by the Americans. Let us look at the record, which is always a good thing to do.

A Look at the Record

I should like to draw your attention to certain treaties entered into by the Soviet Union Government over quite a period of time. The treaties, perhaps, are not spread over a long period, but the practice is. The first one is a treaty with Germany, signed by the Soviet Union Government on March 3, 1918, at Brest Litovsk. Chapter 5, section 17, reads:

Prisoners of war of both parties will be released into their homeland insofar as they do not, with the consent of the capturing state, desire to remain within the latter's territory or betake themselves into another country.

Section 18 of the same treaty reads:

The interned or deported civilian nationals of both Parties will be conveyed home as soon as possible and without expense insofar as they do not desire, with the consent of the State in which they sojourn, to remain within the latter's territory or betake themselves into another country.

Pretty good doctrine, very early in the life of the Soviet Union Government. The next treaty was signed on the same day, March 3, 1918, with Austro-Hungary. Section 6 reads:

Prisoners of war on each side are, provided they do not elect to remain in the country of their present sojourn or to betake themselves to another country, to be returned to their own country with all possible dispatch.

That is, they were to be returned with all possible dispatch if they did not elect to remain in the country of their present sojourn. Next, on December 18, 1919, the Soviet Union Government and Denmark signed an agreement relating to the mutual repatriation of nationals. It was signed at Copenhagen. Part of it reads:

As soon as the Soviet Government notifies the Danish Government that the former Russian prisoners of war now found in Denmark who desire to return to Soviet Russia may enter within Soviet Russia's frontiers, and as soon as the vessels necessary for this movement are available, the said prisoners of war shall be dispatched to the place indicated by the Soviet Government.

The Soviet Government shall give the Danes remaining in Soviet Russia who desire to return to Denmark the opportunity to do so as soon as the conditions of war permit.

Next, the treaty of peace, with annexes, signed with Estonia at Tartu on February 2, 1920; paragraph 1 of the annex to article 9 reads:

Prisoners of war of both Contracting Parties shall be repatriated unless they prefer to remain in the country in which they are (with the consent of the Government of that country) or to go to some other country.

A treaty was signed by the Soviet Government with France: an agreement relating to the mutual repatriation of nationals with a note, supplemen-

tary agreement, and a declaration signed at Copenhagen April 20, 1920. It reads in part:

I. The French Government shall repatriate to Soviet Russia and the Soviet Ukraine all the Russian military personnel who so desire as well as those who form part of the Russian expeditionary force in France and in Macedonia and those who have become prisoners of war now present in France, Algiers, Salonika or in any other territory subject to French authority where they might have been sent by the French Government. According to the conditions mentioned below, the People's Commissars shall notify the representative commissioned for this purpose by the French Government of all French nationals, civilians as well as military, found in localities subject to the authority of Soviet Russia and the Ukraine who do not refuse repatriation by written announcement.

Next is a treaty between the Soviet Government and the United Kingdom, signed at Copenhagen on February 12, 1920, containing an agreement regarding the exchange of prisoners of war, with annexes. Article 4 reads:

The British Government undertakes, subject to the provisions of article 8, to secure the delivery to the Soviet Government of the Russian combatant prisoners and civilian officials who are in the custody of the Archangel Government and who have been captured at any time since the landing of the British forces in North Russia. This undertaking will apply to all those whose release is desired by the Soviet Government and who themselves desire to leave the territory under the control of the Archangel Government.

Article 7 says, and I might as well read it all:

The Soviet Government will repatriate all British combatants including those who may subsequently fall into the hands of the Soviet armies within one month from the signing of this agreement and all civilian prisoners except those committed for grave offenses and all British nationals at present in Soviet Russia as far as they can be identified who may wish to return to any portion of the British Empire.

Then comes a treaty between the Soviet Government and Germany, signed in Berlin on April 19, 1920—an agreement regarding the mutual repatriation of prisoners of war and interned civilians:

Prisoners of war and interned civilians of both sides are to be repatriated in all cases where they themselves desire it. The repatriation shall begin without delay and shall be carried out with the utmost dispatch.

Next is a treaty between the Soviet Government and Italy, signed at Copenhagen on April 27, 1920, an agreement regarding prisoners of war and interned civilians:

The Royal Italian Government shall undertake to transport under the best possible conditions all the Russian prisoners who have expressed the desire to return to Soviet Russia, to Odessa or to another Black Sea Port of the Soviet Republics (which will be indicated by the Soviet Government), while supplying in that respect all the necessary means for transporting said prisoners. With respect to the natives of those provinces which constitute a part of the Soviet States but have detached themselves from Russia, the Soviet Government shall not admit such natives to its territory unless they have signed a declaration expressing the desire to return to the territory of the Soviet Republics.

There is a treaty with Austria concerning the return of prisoners of war, signed at Copenhagen on July 5, 1920. According to article 1:

Both Contracting Parties declare their acceptance of the principle that such prisoners as wish to remain in the country shall not be prevented from doing so.

A treaty with Latvia, signed by the Soviet Government at Riga on August 11, 1920, states in the annex to article 7:

Prisoners of the two Contracting Parties shall be repatriated unless, with the consent of the Government on whose territory they are, they express the desire to remain in the country in which they are or to proceed to any other country.

Another treaty with Latvia: agreement regarding the repatriation of prisoners of war, signed at Riga on November 16, 1920:

Those who express a desire to remain in the country of their imprisonment shall file the proper application with the competent authorities of the State wherein they reside. Upon the satisfaction of such application, said persons shall have the right to remain on the basis of the conditions set forth by these authorities.

A treaty with Poland, convention regarding repatriation, with additional protocols, signed at Riga on February 24, 1921:

The two contracting parties undertake, immediately after the signature of this present agreement, to proceed with the speedy repatriation of all hostages, civilian prisoners, interned persons, prisoners of war, exiles, refugees and migrants who are at present within the boundaries of their respective territories.

Article 2 defines these categories which I have mentioned. According to article 3, "The above-mentioned persons are free to return to their native countries; they cannot be directly or indirectly compelled to do so."

A treaty with Turkey: convention regarding repatriation, signed by the Soviet Union Government at Moscow on March 28, 1921:

Article 2: The mutual repatriation of prisoners shall be effected with their consent. Forced repatriation shall in no way be admissible.

That is very vigorous.

The bureau for the registration of prisoners shall gather from the military and civilian prisoners who have declared their unwillingness to be repatriated detailed information regarding place of birth, name and surname, place of residence, positions occupied and profession; such shall be communicated to the delegation of the other party, as foreseen by Article 9 of the present convention.

A treaty with Hungary: agreement regarding the exchange of prisoners of war and interned civilians, signed at Riga on July 28, 1921:

Article 3: those of the persons mentioned in the annex (Russian prisoners of war and civilians and Hungarian prisoners of war and civilians) who do not desire to leave Hungary may remain there. In this case existing convictions shall not be withdrawn. In order to establish that there is a free expression of will among such persons, the Russian Government shall be permitted to send to Hungary a neutral person who will be permitted, directly and

without limitations, to communicate with such persons in order to establish a free expression of their will.

According to Article 5:

In order to notify the prisoners of war and civilians about the possibility of repatriation offered them, the contracting governments shall undertake to publish the resolutions of the present treaty throughout their country in the usual way.

Then there is a little homily in this treaty which is very interesting:

Repatriation ought not to be enforced; it is left to the free choice of the prisoner to return to his homeland, in agreement with the present treaty, or to remain in the country in which he resides at present, with the agreement of the government of that country. This free expression of will may be established by the representatives of the two countries or expressed in written form by the prisoner. The contracting parties shall undertake to transmit at will to one another these written expressions of will.

The treaty with Austria, signed in Vienna on December 7, 1921, entered into force February 14, 1922: agreement concerning the repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees:

Article 1: the contracting Governments assume the responsibility of conducting with the utmost dispatch the repatriation of the prisoners of war and civilian internees who have not yet been repatriated. Only in agreement with the Government of their homeland may prisoners of war or civilian internees be retained because of investigations or sentences based on disciplinary infractions or any kind of offense committed before the date of the signing of this supplementary agreement. No retained person, however, may be delivered to his homeland against his will.

Those are treaties signed by the Soviet Union Government. As Mr. Casey, the Foreign Minister of Australia, told us the other day, in World War II the Soviet Union, in an ultimatum to the commander of the German troops at Stalingrad on January 8, 1943, guaranteed to all who surrendered that, after the end of the war they would be allowed to return to Germany, or to any country where war prisoners might desire to go.

Later, in the Budapest area, a similar offer was made to German troops. And this is very interesting: a Soviet Union publication refers to these episodes as expressing the highest act of humanitarianism. And I agree with that. That, indeed, is the international practice, the international law, in relation to this subject.

Present State of Proposals Regarding Prisoners of War

Now, let us look at the present state of the proposals in regard to prisoners of war. The package proposal, as I mentioned a moment ago, is still open. With regard to the prisoners of war, here are the variations which have been offered by the Unified Command at the present time.

First, it has been offered that joint Red Cross teams from both sides, with or without military observers from both sides, shall be admitted to the

prisoner-of-war camps of both sides to verify whether alleged nonrepatriates would, in fact, forcibly resist return to the side from which they came. That is, this question of screening which we were talking about a moment ago should be undertaken by joint Red Cross teams from both sides, with or without military teams.

Another suggestion which we have made is that all prisoners of war on both sides should be delivered in groups in a neutral area and should there be given opportunity to express their attitude toward repatriation. This attitude could be expressed to and determined by any one of the following groups or combinations of groups: one, by the International Committee of the Red Cross; another, by teams from impartial nations; a third, by joint military teams from the Communist side and the United Nations side; a fourth, by joint Red Cross teams. Or, it might be done by any combination of any of these.

That would mean that they would be taken to a neutral zone and asked by this impartial body—which may be composed of any one of these groups, or all of them—whether they would resist or whether they would not. If they said they were going to resist, they would not have to be returned.

On September 28 we gave three more variations of this suggestion. One was that the agreement should say that all prisoners are entitled to be released and repatriated. That is their right; they are entitled to it. The obligation of the two military sides is discharged by taking a prisoner to this agreed neutral place, where he will be identified and his name checked against the agreed list of prisoners of war, and at that time any prisoner who indicated that he wishes to return to the side which had detained him will be permitted to do so, and if he does return to this side he would not be kept as a prisoner of war but will be released. We thought that this was very ingenious and met almost all difficulties. It met the question of repatriation. The prisoner was repatriated in the neutral zone but not turned over to the Communists. He was brought there and then, if he said he wished to return, he returned. But it was all done on an accepted principle. We thought that a fairly promising arrangement.

Another suggestion was that prisoners who would not resist repatriation should be expeditiously exchanged and that all prisoners who had indicated to the Unified Command that they would forcibly resist repatriation would be delivered to the demilitarized zone in small groups, where they would be entirely free from the military control of either side. There, they would be interviewed by representatives of a mutually agreed country or countries not participating in the Korean hostilities, and they would be free to go either north or south as they might choose.

A third proposal was that there should not be any interviewing at all. The prisoners would be taken in small groups to the neutral zone and

there they would be turned loose and told, "that way is north, that is North Korea; that way is south, that is South Korea—take whichever way you wish." They would not be interviewed or asked any questions but would themselves decide which way they wanted to go.

All of those suggestions were submitted. They were rejected on October 8. Mr. Vyshinsky told us a number of times that on that day some new proposals were made and that the members would not have known anything about them if he had not mentioned it. His idea of what is new is, of course, his, and if he regards these as new, why then to him they are new. They are, in fact, the proposals which had been made by the Communist side without any change or interruption for at least the past 5 months. Perhaps that makes them new—I do not know—but that is what they are.

When this was done, General Harrison recessed the discussions. He expressed his willingness to return at any time when the Communist side would either say it was ready to accept any one of the variations we put forward or make some proposal of its own in good faith. But they have not done that. Therefore, let us examine this so-called new proposal of October 8 and see how new it is.

"New" Soviet Proposal

This is the proposal, and it is contained in the letter which the representative of the United States here sent to the Secretary-General on October 20, 1952.² It reads as follows:

On the basis of the just command that war prisoners of both sides shall all be repatriated home to lead a peaceful life, our side proposed that when the armistice agreement becomes effective, all war prisoners may be brought to the agreed exchange point in the demilitarized zone as your side has proposed, to be delivered to and received by the other side.

This is how new this is. All prisoners are to be brought to this neutral zone and turned over to the Communists. Very well, then what happens?

After they are delivered and received, the Joint Red Cross Teams will visit the war prisoners of both sides in accordance with paragraph 57 of the draft Korean Armistice Agreement as your side has proposed—

We have not proposed anything like this, but I suppose that does not matter—

to explain to them that they are ensured to return home to lead a peaceful life and not to participate again in hostilities in Korea.

In other words, the Red Cross teams go to them and say, "You are going home. We hope you are going to lead a peaceful life, but we do not know."

Thereafter, considered classification of the war prisoners will be carried out in accordance with the above-mentioned principle of classification according to nationality and area as proposed by our side.

² See p. 753.

Now that is not very clear. You will find that true of most communications from the Communists on this subject. What it means is that after we have turned over all the prisoners to the Communists, considered classification of the war prisoners will be carried out. That is, the war prisoners will be classified in what way? In accordance with the above-mentioned principle of nationality and area.

That means you classify everyone as Chinese or Koreans, and then you divided the Koreans into North Koreans and South Koreans. That is the classification which takes place. Then what happens?

Repatriation will be carried out immediately after the classification; these tasks of exchange, visit, classification and repatriation may be accomplished under the observation of Neutral Nations Inspection Teams.

This is a very confused and wordy way of saying what the Communists have always said, namely, "All North Koreans and all Chinese must be turned over to us, and the people whom you have in custody who lived in South Korea can remain there." They have been saying that without interruption for the past 4 or 5 months, and that is what Mr. Vyshinsky says is new. I hope that he will have plenty of time in which to explain to us just why it is new.

It is not only not new, but it is disingenuous and calculated to mislead. I think that can be seen already. The statement about all prisoners of war shall be brought to the exchange point, as the United Nations side has proposed, sounds as though they are accepting something that we have proposed. We said that they should be brought to this neutral point for the purpose of being questioned by neutral observers to find out whether or not they want to go any farther. That is what we proposed.

The Communists say that they will be brought to this neutral point "as your side has proposed" and there they shall be delivered to and received by the other side. Then they say that after they are delivered and received, the Joint Red Cross Teams will visit the war prisoners of both sides in accordance with paragraph 57 of the agreement to explain to them that they are going home. All that paragraph 57 says is that during repatriation, the Red Cross can go along and give them coffee and sandwiches and care for their wounds if they are sick. That is all they are supposed to do. The Red Cross is coming into this to do something which it looks as though we had proposed. All they are going to do is to tell these poor fellows, "The Chinese are going back to China and the North Koreans are going back to North Korea." That is no job for the Red Cross. Then there is talk here that the "classification and repatriation may be accomplished under the observation of Neutral Nations Inspection Teams." What difference does that make? If they are going to be

classified as Chinese and North or South Koreans, the only fellow who can ever get a break out of that is someone who claims he is a South Korean and obtains confirmation by the inspection team that he is South Korean.

That is what the new proposal was. It goes right back to forcible repatriation. In order that it will not be thought that all of this is spun out of that one paragraph, before they get into this the Communists make it very clear that that is what they are talking about. They say:

Therefore, no ground whatsoever can be found either for your so-called principle of voluntary wishes or for your so-called principle of screening in international practice or the Geneva Convention, or even in the draft armistice agreement agreed upon by both sides; in contradistinction, the proposition firmly maintained by our side that prisoners of war of both sides shall all be repatriated home is a principle recognized by the whole world. It is solely due to the obstinate insistence of your side upon its unreasonable proposition that the only remaining question in the Korean armistice negotiations, that is, the question of repatriation of war prisoners, had dragged on for five months . . . (document A/2230).

So you see that there is no question about the fact that they are reasserting what they say they have reasserted for 5 months. And when they were pointing out that this is a principle which is universally recognized by the whole world, they unfortunately did not know of the 17 cases about which I told you this afternoon and to which their great friend and patron, the Soviet Union, had agreed.

Communist Position on Armistice

Press release 825 dated October 21

In a letter on October 16 to General Clark, Commander of the U.N. Forces in Korea, Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-Huai, commanders of the North Korean and Chinese Communist troops, presented the latest Communist position on the armistice.

A careful analysis of this communication reveals that it not only contains nothing new but is actually, in several respects, a retrogression from proposals previously agreed upon.

However, the October 16 letter to General Clark clarified some of the ambiguities in the statement made by the Communists at Panmunjom on October 8, and the letter sent by General Nam Il, senior member of the Communists' armistice delegation, to General Harrison on October 11 makes it even clearer that the Communists are not accepting any part of the proposals advanced by General Harrison on September 28¹ nor does it advance any constructive proposals of their own.

The Communist efforts to represent their position, which was fully stated at the October 8 meeting at Panmunjom and in the letters to Generals Harrison and Clark, as even a partial acceptance

of the U.N. Command proposals for the repatriation of prisoners of war, is a flagrant misrepresentation of the factual situation and is designed to conceal and confuse the fact of their total rejection of the three reasonable solutions offered by the U.N. Command on September 28.

The letter to General Clark, which represents the latest and most detailed statement of the Communist position, proposes that prisoners of war be brought to a demilitarized zone to be delivered to and received by the other side. After they are delivered and received, the letter states, joint Red Cross teams would visit prisoners of both sides to explain that they are to be returned home to lead peaceful lives and that they are not again to take part in hostilities in Korea. Thereafter, the letter adds, classification of prisoners according to nationality and area would be carried out.

The Communists claim that this represents a concession to proposals of the U.N. Command. However, it already had been agreed in the armistice draft that prisoner-of-war exchange would take place in a demilitarized zone. The armistice draft also provides that joint teams would visit prisoners of war, pending completion of exchange, for humanitarian purposes, but the Communists have now regressed to the position that joint teams would visit the prisoners only after the exchange had been completed. This scheme is nothing but forced repatriation, with the joint teams standing by as helpless witnesses.

The letter to General Clark represents a further regression on the part of the Communists in that it apparently requires the turning over to the Communists of even those prisoners whose homes are in the Republic of Korea so the Communists can determine the location of their homes before repatriation occurs. In March 1952 the Communists had agreed that they would not demand the return of prisoners whose residence had been in the Republic of Korea prior to June 25, 1950.

The Communists' proposals clearly demand that the U.N. Command turn over all prisoners to the Communists by force, where necessary, and in the foregoing respects are a step backward from the agreements so far arrived at in the negotiations.

In his reply of October 20, General Clark very properly made it clear that he does not consider that the letter provides a basis for resuming the meetings of the armistice delegations.

Texts of Correspondence

U.S./U.N. press release dated October 20

Letter of 11 October 1952 from General Nam Il, Senior Delegate, Delegation of the Korean People's Army and Chinese People's Volunteers, to Lieutenant-General William K. Harrison, Senior Delegate, United Nations Command Delegation

On 8 October your side, in disregard of the reasonable proposal put forth by our side for the settlement of the

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 6, 1952, p. 549.

question of repatriation of war prisoners through negotiation, unilaterally declared an indefinite recess, and, without waiting for our side to speak, left the conference in the middle and categorically called off the Korean armistice negotiations in which the people of the whole world are concerned. This series of unreasonable actions on the part of your side is obviously a clear demonstration of your systematic disruption of the negotiations. It is absolutely not to be tolerated by the peace-loving people of the whole world. Since the beginning of the discussion of the question of repatriation of the so-called voluntary repatriation which is in actuality forcible retention of war prisoners, a proposition which is in complete violation of the 1949 Geneva Convention. Your side has never made any earnest negotiator effort for the settlement of the question. In order to realize this unreasonable demand, your side has carried out a series of provocative actions inside and outside of the conference. This time your side even refused to negotiate and broke off the negotiations at a time when our side put forth a reasonable proposal which is capable of settling the question of repatriation of war prisoners. This is indeed a premeditated action taken by your side in an attempt thereby to bring pressure to bear on the forthcoming plenary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations so that it may approve the plot of your side to break up the negotiations and extend the war. On our part, we have consistently maintained that all the questions in the armistice negotiations should be settled through negotiation on a fair and reasonable basis. In the case of the question of repatriation of war prisoners which is now the sole issue blocking an armistice in Korea, our side holds firmly the righteous position of the Geneva Convention and adheres to the paragraphs of the armistice agreement which are already agreed upon by both sides; our side will never abandon the fair and reasonable principle of the total repatriation of war prisoners by both sides. However, for the sake of settling the question our side has always held that method and procedure of the release and repatriation of all of the war prisoners can be negotiated, and in the proposal made by our side this time our side has adopted the views of your side with respect to the transport of all of the war prisoners to the demilitarized zone to be exchanged. A distinct and sharp contrast is formed between the repeated negotiator efforts made by our side for the settlement of the question of war prisoners and the action of your side which dogmatically refused to negotiate and broke off the negotiations. Facts are more eloquent than words. Your side cannot escape the grave responsibility for disrupting the Korean armistice negotiations. Regarding your action of refusing to negotiate and breaking off the negotiations, I am instructed to lodge with your side a strong protest. Your side must bear full responsibility for all the consequences arising from your action.

Letter of Reply of 16 October 1952 From Lieutenant General Harrison to General Nam Il

This is in reply to your letter of 11 October 1952. The proposal set forth by your side at the meeting on 8 October was considered by the United Nations Command delegation at the time you presented it. It was found to be neither new nor reasonable, and only reiterated your insistence that the United Nations Command must return all prisoners of war to your control even though you realize that we must use force to do so. Mere reiteration of a proposal which requires the United Nations Command to forcibly repatriate all prisoners of war does not constitute a constructive proposal designed to achieve an armistice.

I note that you recognize the action taken by the United Nations Command delegation to be a recess. Having recognized this fact, any attempt on your part of employing half-truths, lies, and distortion of facts in your propa-

ganda effort to make the peace-loving people of the world believe otherwise is doomed to failure.

To avoid any possibility that you might have, intentionally or otherwise, misunderstood my statement on 8 October, I say again, we have merely recessed them. We will meet with you whenever you indicate that you are willing to accept one of our proposals or have presented in writing the text of any constructive proposal designed to achieve an armistice that you may desire to make. Our liaison officers will be available for consultation and for transaction of their customary duties.

Letter of 16 October 1952, from Kim Il Sung, Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army, and Peng Teh-Huai, Commander of the Chinese People's Volunteers, to General Mark W. Clark, Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command

When the people throughout the world including the people of the United States of America were eagerly awaiting the realization of peace in Korea, when a complete agreement was nearly reached in the Korean armistice negotiation, your delegation, in disregard of the proposal put forth by our delegation, suddenly declared unilaterally an indefinite recess on 8 October 1952, refused to negotiate and broke up the negotiations. This unreasonable action is in itself sufficient to prove that your side has no sincerity at all for an armistice in Korea, and that your side should bear the total responsibility for the disruption of the armistice negotiations.

The Korean armistice negotiations have gone on for fifteen months. During these fifteen months, your side has made various unreasonable demands, including that of drawing the military demarcation line between both sides deep in the area of our side, dispatching military personnel to conduct ground and air inspection in our rear following the armistice, interfering in the construction of air fields by our side, and other unreasonable demands. In the meantime, your side incessantly violated the agreement of neutrality in the conference site area and resorted to the so-called military pressure outside of the conference, even resorting to the bombing of peaceful inhabitants and peaceful towns and villages with germ bombs, napalm and poison gas bombs, in an attempt thereby to force our side into submission. But what your side has not been able to gain on the battlefield is likewise never to be gained by your side in the conference. These unreasonable actions and attempts of your side have failed and will continue to fall. On the other hand, our side had, during these fifteen months, maintained the principle of fairness and reasonableness with great effort and patience so that the draft armistice agreement of sixty-three paragraphs including the nine agreed paragraphs pertaining to the arrangements relating to prisoners of war was finally completed in the armistice negotiations. Had there not been the deliberate obstruction by your side to the settlement of the question of prisoners of war, the Korean armistice should certainly have been realized long ago, peace should certainly have been restored long ago in South Korea and North Korea, and the prisoners of war of both sides should certainly have returned home long ago to lead a peaceful life.

The proposition held by your side on the question of prisoners of war is that of the so-called "no forced repatriation." But this proposition is devoid of any basis either in law or in facts; it is a pretext fabricated by your side purely for the purpose of delaying and disrupting the negotiations. As everybody knows, prisoners captured in war are totally different from political refugees. Therefore, it is especially stipulated in article 118 of the 1949 Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of prisoners of war that "prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities"; it is further laid down in article 7 that "prisoners

of war may in no circumstances renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them by the present Convention". These stipulations are obviously designed to prevent either belligerent from taking the inhuman action following the armistice of retaining prisoners of war by force and refusing to repatriate them home under the pretext of the so-called principle of voluntary wishes. Actually, in past international wars, prisoners of war of both belligerents were always repatriated in toto after the cessation of hostilities. That is why your delegation could not but agree to the following provisions in the draft armistice agreements: "All prisoners of war held in the custody of each side at the time this armistice agreement becomes effective shall be released and repatriated as soon as possible" (paragraph 51), "within this time limit (referring to the time limit of two months after the armistice agreement becomes effective) each side undertakes to complete the repatriation of all of the prisoners of war in its custody at the earliest practicable time" (paragraph 54).

In fact of international practice, the stipulations of the Geneva Convention, and the paragraphs already agreed upon by both sides in the draft Korean armistice agreement, your side has already no reason whatsoever to oppose the principle that prisoners of war of both sides shall be repatriated in toto. Yet your side dogmatically asserts that there are captured personnel of our side who indicate that they are unwilling to rejoin their beloved ones to lead a peaceful life and, on the contrary, wish to remain as refugees and cannon fodder under the dark tyranny of their enemy, notorious to the whole world, to which they have also been opposed. This is utterly against common sense of human beings and is therefore wholly incredible. In order to expose the falsity of your assertion, it is sufficient to cite the facts that to date, in the prisoner of war camps of your side, day after day, our captured personnel are still being slaughtered, persecuted, tattooed and forced to make finger-printing and they are protesting against these atrocities. The message addressed by your Brigadier General Colson to our captured personnel is a definite proof of these facts.

When the classification of the war prisoners was being discussed, in view of the fact that your side had raised the matter of their being Korean prisoners of war of both sides whose homes were in the area of the detaining side, our side proposed to recheck the name lists in accordance with the principles of classification according to nationality and area, that is, armed personnel of foreign nationality captured by either side, i. e., captured personnel of the United Nations Forces or of the Chinese People's Volunteers, shall all be repatriated home; of the Korean armed personnel captured by either side, i. e. of the captured personnel of the South Korean Army or of the Korean People's Army, those whose homes are in the area of the side which they belong shall all be repatriated home, while the others whose homes are in the area of the detaining side may be permitted to return home directly without having to be repatriated. It is also stipulated in the draft Korean armistice agreement that "the release and repatriation of such prisoners of war shall be effected in conformity with lists which have been exchanged and have been checked by the respective sides prior to the signing of this armistice agreement" (paragraph 51) and that "each side insures that it will not employ in acts of war in the Korean conflict any prisoner of war released and repatriated incident to the coming into effect of this armistice agreement" (paragraph 52).

However, when the name lists were actually checked, your side in both occasions did not follow the principle of classification proposed by our side, but applied to the prisoners of war the so-called principle of screening, which is in actuality forcible retention, in total violation of the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the draft armistice agreement concerning the total repatriation of war prisoners and the assurance that they will return home to lead a peaceful life. Therefore, no ground whatsoever can be found either for your so-called prin-

ciple of voluntary wishes or for your so-called principle of screening in international practice or the Geneva Convention, or even in the draft armistice agreement agreed upon by both sides; in contradistinction, the proposition firmly maintained by our side that prisoners of war of both sides shall all be repatriated home is a principle recognized by the whole world. It is solely due to the obstinate insistence of your side upon its unreasonable proposition that the only remaining question in the Korean armistice negotiations, that is, the question of repatriation of war prisoners, had dragged on for five months since May this year and has been prevented from attaining any settlement.

Recently, because the people throughout the world, and firstly the people of Asia and the Pacific area, have become increasingly impatient with the delay of the Korean armistice negotiations, because even the American people have come to consider the war of intervention against Korea a "damned war", and because the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the United States presidential Election have approached, your delegation on 28 September spuriously put forth three proposals for the repatriation of war prisoners in an attempt to hoodwink the people of the world with the words of the so-called "total repatriation", but in substance, these proposals are still run through by your unreasonable demand of the so-called "no forced repatriation" which is in fact forcible retention of war prisoners. In the meantime, your side audaciously and unilaterally disposed of our captured personnel without waiting for the conclusion of an agreement on the question of repatriation of war prisoners. It can be seen from this that you are not even prepared to carry out your own proposals.

Yet on our part, in order to hold firmly to our stand for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question and to meet the eager desire of the world people for an armistice in Korea, we still adopted certain reasonable factors from your proposals in spite of the fact that the principle underlying your three proposals was wholly unacceptable, and on 8 October we put forth our new proposal.

On the basis of the just demand that war prisoners of both sides shall all be repatriated home to lead a peaceful life, our side proposed that when the armistice agreement becomes effective, all war prisoners, may be brought to the agreed exchange point in the demilitarized zone as soon as your side has proposed, to be delivered to and received by the other side. After they are delivered and received, the Joint Red Cross Teams will visit the war prisoners of both sides in accordance with paragraph 57 of the draft Korean Armistice Agreement as your side has proposed, to explain to them that they are insured to return home to lead a peaceful life and not to participate again in hostilities in Korea. Thereafter considered classification of the war prisoners will be carried out in accordance with the above-mentioned principle of classification according to nationality and area as proposed by our side. Repatriation will be carried out immediately after the classification; these tasks of exchange, visit, classification and repatriation may be accomplished under the observation of Neutral Nations Inspection Teams.

The above-mentioned proposal of ours is in full accord with the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the draft Korean Armistice Agreement. At the plenary conference of the delegations on 8 October, your delegation not only ignored this reasonable proposal of ours and refused to conduct discussion, but immediately read a statement prepared beforehand and unilaterally declared an indefinite recess; furthermore, your delegation left the conference in the middle without waiting for our reply and categorically broke off the Korean armistice negotiations in which the people of the whole world are concerned. This unreasonable action of disrupting the negotiations taken by your side is obviously premeditated. Your side possibly attempts thereby to press the General Assembly of the United Nations to endorse your plot to violate international conventions, to disrupt the armistice negotiations and to extend the war. But it can be definitely said that

the peace-loving people all over the world absolutely will not permit your plot to win through.

The situation is already very clear, but we are still willing to make our greatest effort to promote an armistice in Korea. We hereby put forth to you the following requests:

1. That the unreasonable action of breaking off the armistice negotiations taken by your delegation be stopped immediately.
2. That total repatriations of war prisoners must be carried out in accordance with international practice, of the 1949 Geneva Convention and with the already agreed draft Korean Armistice Agreement. The method and the procedure of its concrete implementation can be settled through consultation in the negotiations.
3. That an armistice in Korea be realized speedily on the basis of the draft Korean Armistice Agreement.

If your side still has the slightest sincerity for an armistice in Korea and a peaceful settlement of the Korean question, you should give an affirmative reply to the above-mentioned reasonable request by our side. The peace-loving people and nations all over the world are focusing their attention on this action of your side.

Letter of Reply of 20 October 1952 from General Clark to Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-Huai

Your letter of 16 October 1952, has been received. I regret that you have seen fit to use this means to repeat completely false and unfounded charges and to indulge generally in a pointless harangue. I have no intention of replying in kind.

For fifteen months the United Nations Command, acting in good faith, has made an honest effort to negotiate an armistice that is fair and reasonable to both sides. A great deal of progress has been achieved and the people of the world have looked with hope for an armistice which would end the bloodshed in Korea. This hope could have become a reality many months ago had your side exhibited similar good faith and been willing to accept the humane principle of not forcing prisoners who feared for their lives to be returned to you against their will.

The United Nations Command Senior Delegate presented to your delegation three additional proposals on 28 September 1952, any one of which could have led to a fair and just armistice. Your side summarily rejected these reasonable proposals without offering any constructive counterproposal which would recognize the individual's right of self-determination. One of the proposals offered by the United Nations Command provided for the release of those prisoners of war who had previously expressed their objections to repatriation by their delivery in groups of appropriate size to a mutually agreed-upon location in the demilitarized zone to be there freed from the military control of both sides. This proposal further provided that without questioning, interview or screening, each individual so released would be free to go to the side of his choice, and that, if desired, this movement and disposition of non-repatriates would be accomplished under the observation of one or a combination of the International Committee of the Red Cross, joint teams of military observers, or Red Cross representatives from both sides. This procedure parallels in principle the action which your side claims it took in releasing some 50,000 unaccounted for United Nations Command personnel admittedly captured by your side and allegedly "released at the front." The fact that your side claims to have previously followed such a practice makes your present position in refusing to accept the United Nations Command proposal completely inconsistent and clearly exposes the fraudulent nature of your charge that the United Nations Command desires to forcibly retain any prisoners. Each of our proposals submitted on 28 September refutes this false charge. Each abounds with

absolute safeguards which would preclude any possibility of coercion by either side.

Your delegation, by refusing to accept any obviously fair and just proposals offered by the United Nations Command, has created grave doubt in the minds of people everywhere concerning the sincerity of your expressed desire for an end to the bloodshed in Korea.

The United Nations Command Senior Delegate made it completely clear in his statement at the 8 October session and in his letter of 16 October that the United Nations Command delegation was not terminating the negotiations but stood ready to meet with your delegation at any time it is ready to accept any one of the United Nations Command proposals or to submit in writing a constructive proposal which would meet the reasonable requirements of the United Nations Command. The United Nations Command did not break off negotiations as you falsely charge and the United Nations Command delegation is ready and willing to meet with your delegation as soon as you indicate willingness to negotiate in good faith on the basis indicated by the United Nations Command delegation in the plenary session of 8 October 1952.

I consider that your letter of 16 October 1952 contains nothing new nor constructive. Although for your own devious reasons you have sought to embellish your so-called new proposal with tinsel trimmings, claiming that you have adopted "certain reasonable factors" from our proposals, in fact, your so-called proposal bears not the slightest resemblance to the United Nations Command proposals of 28 September. The underlying nature of your proposal is clearly revealed in your demand that "all war prisoners . . . be delivered to and received by" your side. This is nothing more than a demand that the United Nations Command turn over to your custody by force thousands of prisoners of war who have stated positively that they would violently resist repatriation to your side. You further glibly propose that after the United Nations Command has forced unwilling prisoners into your hands you would then carry out a classification according to nationality and area of residence and repatriate prisoners in accordance with this classification. As far back as July you proposed such a classification, knowing full well that irrespective of nationality many prisoners were determined not to go back to your side. The United Nations Command exposed the falseness of this device of yours months ago. Thus, when all is said and done your so-called new proposal is nothing more than the same old package containing your time-worn demand that the United Nations Command drive unwilling prisoners back to your custody. It should be clear to you by now that the United Nations Command will never agree to nor negotiate further on the basis of any proposal that would require the United Nations Command to use force to repatriate prisoners to your side. Accordingly, the United Nations Command considers that your letter of 16 October 1952 does not constitute a valid basis for resumption of delegation meetings.

Communiqués Regarding Korea to the Security Council

The Headquarters of the United Nations Command has transmitted communiqués regarding Korea to the Secretary-General of the United Nations under the following numbers: S/2755, August 28; S/2781, September 17; S/2785, September 23; S/2787, September 24; S/2788, September 25; S/2790, September 26; S/2792, September 29; S/2795, September 29; S/2797, October 2; S/2799, October 3; S/2800, October 6; S/2806, October 7; S/2807, October 9; S/2813, October 16; S/2814, October 14.

Continued Support Urged for Palestine Refugee Program

*Statement by Philip C. Jessup
U. S. Delegate to the General Assembly¹*

The Committee has before it two reports dealing with the work of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency—the Annual Report of the Director and the special report of the Director and Advisory Commission.² These reports, together with Mr. Blandford's admirable statement to this Committee last Thursday, have furnished an account of the accomplishments of the Agency in the first year of its 3-year program of relief and reintegration initiated by the General Assembly last year without an opposing vote.

The Assembly's action in adopting this forward-looking 3-year program was significant for the refugees, for the Near Eastern states which have given them refuge, and for the United Nations. For the refugees, this program serves a dual function: It provides relief where relief is needed but offers real hope of a self-sustaining and self-respecting future. For the Near Eastern states, the program means a substantial increment in financial and human assets and a simultaneous easing of one of the most difficult problems besetting this great and troubled region. For the United Nations, the program furnishes a graphic example of the highly practical ways in which the international community can deal with problems of widespread human misfortune.

Under the thoughtful guidance of Mr. Blandford and his able staff, the program of the Relief and Works Agency is now launched. The action required by the Assembly this year is to take the necessary administrative steps to maintain the program already set in motion by last year's Assembly. These necessary steps are set out in the two reports before us and arise out of the

present status of the program as described in these reports. In considering the action this Assembly should take, it is important not to lose sight of the magnitude of the Agency's task and the extent of its accomplishments.

During the past year, the Agency has housed, fed, and clothed more than 880,000 Palestine refugees scattered over an area of more than 100,000 square miles. In addition to carrying out this immediate task, the Agency has moved forward with plans for long-range and large-scale projects—projects the launching of which will mean jobs and wages for thousands now on relief rolls. Pending the initiation of these projects, the problems confronting the Agency have been difficult indeed; it is obvious that it has not been possible to do all that one would have wished to see done. If it had been possible, Mr. Blandford would have accomplished it. His skill and devotion as Director merit our gratitude and highest praise.

The difficulty is, however, inherent in the situation as long as the major task confronting the Agency remains one of relief. The difficulty will not diminish until the long-range aspects of the Agency's program are well under way. Neither the refugees, nor the governments of the countries in which they reside, nor the contributing states, nor the United Nations can accept in perpetuity a program of relief which can, at best, furnish only a stop-gap solution to this inheritance from the Palestine conflict. Indeed no one maintains that they should accept it. For those refugees who do not choose the alternative of repatriation, we must offer something better than continual relief.

Planning for Ultimate Self-Support

Accordingly, my Government is following with particular interest progress in the planning and negotiation of projects looking toward the refugees' self-support. We agree with the suggestion in the report of the Director that the Agency

¹ Made in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on Oct. 27 and released to the press by the U.S. delegation to the U.N. on the same date.

² Annual Report of the Director [John B. Blandford, Jr.] of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, 1 July 1951-30 June 1952, U.N. doc. A/2171; Special Joint Report of the Director and Advisory Commission of the Agency, U.N. doc. A/2171/Add. 1.

should seek large projects and the cooperation of other sources in their financing to obtain the ultimate large-scale benefits to the refugees that will ensue from coordinated economic development. Individual projects which have as their principal goal enabling the refugees to live by their own efforts can provide the maximum benefits to the refugees only if they are coordinated with each other and with the economic developments in the area of which they will be part. The refugees, for their part, when they find opportunities for productive life, will become a source of great strength to the Near East as useful members of their communities. It is encouraging to note in this connection recent statements made by authorities in Jordan and in Syria which relate to the welcome given to the Palestine refugees in those countries. It is only through cooperative effort by the refugees, the Near Eastern countries, the contributing countries, and the Agency that real and lasting progress will be made.

My Government is encouraged by the general interest in this cooperative effort manifested in the contributions which have been forthcoming—with some notable exceptions—from member and non-member states alike. The records indicate that to date 47 countries have made contributions to our common endeavor. Toward the 250-million-dollar program, my Government has thus far made available 110 million dollars, of which only part has as yet been required for the Agency's operations. We are encouraged to believe that this measure of support in which states, private groups, and specialized agencies of the United Nations have joined can make it possible for the Agency and the governments concerned to make firm plans for projects directed toward the execution of the basic program adopted at the sixth session of the General Assembly. My Government is ready to ask our Congress for further funds for the prosecution of the Agency's program, with the proviso, of course, that a fair share of the cost will be met by other nations in a genuine united effort. Nevertheless, the fact is that pledges to the fund are as yet inadequate to fulfill the long-range plan; to succeed, the program must receive wider and more generous support.

We regret that the original time schedule of the Agency of the 3-year plan of rapidly declining relief and rapidly expanding development has not thus far been met. Development projects on which refugees could be gainfully employed are not yet sufficiently advanced.

It follows that it is necessary to make adjustments in budgetary levels previously set for relief; we have no doubt that the relief budget must be expanded for the current year beyond the figure of 18 million dollars which was set at the sixth session of the Assembly. It appears equally clear, unfortunately, that adjustments within the 250-million-dollar program will be necessary for the ensuing fiscal year.

For the present fiscal year, it is the view of my

delegation and the delegations of France, Turkey, and the United Kingdom, that the appropriate figure for relief should be the 23-million-dollar figure recommended to the Assembly in the Joint Report. This view is reflected in the draft resolution which is before you and which I shall shortly discuss in more detail.

Text of Resolution *

U.N. doc. A/Resolution/4
Dated Nov. 6, 1952

The General Assembly

RECALLING its resolutions 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949, 393 (V) of 2 December 1950, and 513 (VI) of 26 January 1952,

HAVING EXAMINED the Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and the Special Joint Report of the Director and Advisory Commission of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency,

NOTING THAT negotiations have taken place between the Agency and Governments of Near Eastern Countries under the programme approved in resolution 513 (VI).

HAVING in mind the goals for the reduction of relief expenditure envisaged in the three-year \$250 million relief and reintegration programme, approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 513 (VI) without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III) or to the provisions of paragraph 4 of resolution 393 (V) relative to reintegration either by repatriation or resettlement.

RECOGNIZING that immediate realization of these goals has not proved possible and that increased relief expenditures are therefore required, with a resultant reduction in the reintegration funds,

1. Authorizes the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to increase the budget for relief to \$23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1953, and to make such further adjustments as it may deem necessary to maintain adequate standards; and to adopt a budget for relief of \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1954 which shall be subject to review at the 8th regular session of the General Assembly;

2. Authorizes the Agency to allocate funds remaining for reintegration according to time schedules deemed appropriate up to 30 June 1954;

3. Requests that negotiations regarding contributions for the programme be carried out with Member and non-Member States by the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds.

* Sponsored by France, Turkey, the U.K. and the U. S. The resolution was approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on Oct. 30 by a vote of 50-0-7 (Soviet bloc, Chile, Iraq) and adopted by the General Assembly on Nov. 6 by a vote of 48-0-6.

In considering the adequacy of the proposed 23-million-dollar figure, note should be taken of certain anticipated—and very substantial—savings which should do much to simplify the financing of relief for the present year. I have in mind the drop in the price of basic foodstuffs, which is expected to result in an economy of roughly 1,700,000 dollars. A second category of saving—amounting to 750 thousand dollars—arises from the progressive removal from relief rolls of those refugees finding employment on the Agency's long-range projects and from the pruning from

the rolls of persons who are not properly classifiable as refugees. A similar reduction in relief expenditures, in the approximate amount of 600 thousand dollars, flows from Israel's action in assuming full responsibility for the 19,000 refugees remaining within her borders. Finally, we must keep in mind the quantities of contributions in kind—for example, the generous donations of Canadian flour and Australian wheat—which comprise an increment for this fiscal year of the equivalent of approximately 800 thousand dollars.

But my Government, and the three governments with which we are cosponsoring the resolution tabled for your consideration, have felt that it would be unwise to set an absolute ceiling on permissible expenditures for relief for the coming year. The proposed 23-million-dollar budget is the best estimate of required expenditures which can be made by those most intimately connected with the program—Mr. Blandford and the members of the Advisory Commission. But this estimate, despite the impressive accuracy suggested by the supporting data, is after all a human estimate. So, since we are dealing with human lives, we feel that some flexibility should be afforded the Agency to modify the stated budgetary figure if circumstances require such action. Accordingly, our draft resolution would permit the Agency to adjust its relief expenditures upward if necessary to maintain adequate standards—or, I may add, downward if unexpected economies can be achieved or if progress on reintegration projects is faster than the Agency presently anticipates.

By contrast, for the ensuing fiscal year of 1954, we have proposed a concrete figure for the relief budget, without provision for Agency revision of that figure, because we shall have the opportunity to review the subject again at the eighth session of the Assembly. I would like merely to note at this time that the relief figure we have in mind for the fiscal year of 1954 will be a substantial reduction from the figure for the current year. This does not mean doing less for the refugees; it means doing more and doing it in a more helpful way. It is the hope of my Government that the U.N. Relief and Works Agency and the states concerned in the Near East will, before the next Assembly meets, have utilized the considerable capital funds available to the Agency to make substantial strides toward carrying out programs of economic development on a cooperative basis. As refugees are afforded increasing opportunities to work on these unfolding programs, wages will progressively replace relief and the refugees will move forward as self-sustaining members of an ever more prosperous Near Eastern community.

And now, if the Committee will bear with me a little longer, I should like to discuss in some detail the brief resolution which my delegation has joined with the delegations of France, Turkey, and the United Kingdom in putting before you.

The draft resolution is a brief and simple document limited to the provisions which are necessary

from the administrative viewpoint to carry forward, in the light of the present circumstances, the 3-year program approved by the Assembly last year.

The preamble of the resolution recalls the relevant previous Assembly resolutions as well as the two reports on which our draft resolution is based; it notes the negotiations between the U.N. Relief and Works Agency and the Near Eastern Governments referred to in Mr. Blandford's report; and it also mentions the goals for the reduction of relief expenditure set forth in the last year's resolution, recognizing the unfortunate fact that the immediate realization of these goals has not proved possible. The preamble thus makes clear that the resolution does not abandon or go back on the principles which the Assembly has already accepted as governing the U.N. program for the Palestine refugees.

The first operative paragraph gives the Agency authority to increase the relief budget to 23 million dollars for the current fiscal year. This is a net increase of 5 million dollars over and above the figure set as a goal by the Assembly last year. Moreover, as indicated on page 16 of the annual report of the Director, the Agency reports inventory adjustment and outstanding commitments of over 2 million dollars which have not actually been used as yet but will be available during the current year, thus providing in effect the equivalent of 25 millions for this fiscal period. Moreover, this paragraph of the resolution gives the Agency the authority to make such further adjustments of the 23-million-dollar figure as it may deem necessary to maintain adequate standards of relief for the refugees. This means, as I have already indicated, that the Agency can spend more than 23 million dollars if more is required. The same paragraph authorizes the Agency to adopt a relief budget of 18 million dollars for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, which shall be subject to the review of the next regular session of the Assembly.

The second paragraph authorizes the Agency to allocate any available funds which remain after the relief needs have been taken care of for the long-range projects according to such time schedules as the Agency considers appropriate. This provision, in effect, removes any limitations on the Agency's allocation of available funds for reintegration purposes.

The third and last operative paragraph gives necessary authority to the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds to carry out negotiations regarding contributions for the program with member and nonmember states.

My delegation hopes that this resolution will commend itself to the Committee and that this Seventh Assembly, following the example of the last Assembly, will provide for the continuation of this very important task without a dissenting vote.

Human Rights Provisions in the Puerto Rican Constitution

U.N. doc. A/2135/Add. 2
Dated September 23, 1952

Introductory Note—Supplementary to the Report on the Application of Human Rights in Non-Self-Governing Territories administered by the United States of America transmitted by the Government of the United States of America to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in October 1951,¹ the following summary of the principal provisions of the new Constitution of Puerto Rico as they relate to the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has been transmitted by the Government of the United States of America in September 1952.

A new Constitution, creating the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, was written by the Puerto Rican people,² ratified by them in a popular referendum, approved by the President, accepted by the United States Congress,³ and proclaimed by the Governor on July 25, 1952.

The preamble to the Constitution reads:

We the people of Puerto Rico, in order to organize ourselves politically on a fully democratic basis, to promote the general welfare, and to secure for ourselves and our posterity the complete enjoyment of human rights, placing our trust in Almighty God, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the Commonwealth which, in the exercise of our natural rights, we now create within our union with the United States of America.

In so doing, we declare:

The democratic system is fundamental to the life of the Puerto Rican community;

We understand that the democratic system of government is one in which the will of the people is the source of public power, the political order is subordinate to the rights of man, and the free participation of the citizen in collective decisions is assured;

We consider as determining factors in our life our citizenship of the United States of America and our aspiration continually to enrich our democratic heritage in the individual and collective enjoyment of its rights and privileges; our loyalty to the principles of the Federal Constitution; the coexistence in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American Hemisphere; our fervor for education; our faith in justice; our devotion to the courageous, industrious, and peaceful way of life; our fidelity to individual human values above and beyond social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and our hope for a better world based upon these principles.

¹ U.N. doc. A/1823/Add.1.

² Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1952.

³ Public Law 447, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 66 Stat. 327.

Civil and Political Rights (Articles 1-20)

The Bill of Rights embodies all of the traditional provisions regarding the basic rights, dignity and equality of man, characteristic of the United States Constitution and the several State Constitutions and in addition recognizes modern economic and social rights.

The dignity of the human being is inviolable; all men are equal before the law; there is no discrimination on grounds of race, color, sex, birth, social origin or condition, or political or religious ideas. There is complete separation of church and state, and no law can be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The laws guarantee the expression of the will of the people by means of equal, direct and secret universal suffrage and protect the citizen against any coercion in the exercise of the electoral franchise.

There is guarantee of freedom of speech and of press and of the right peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances. Persons may join with each other and organize freely for any lawful purposes, except in military or quasi-military organizations.

The right to life, liberty and the enjoyment of property is recognized as a fundamental right of man. All people are given equal protection of the laws. The death penalty does not exist. No person can be deprived of his liberty or property without due process of law, and no law can be enacted impairing the obligation of contracts. A minimum amount of property and possessions shall be exempt from attachment.

Every person has the right to the protection of law against abusive attacks on his honor, reputation, private or family life.

Just compensation must be made in payment for private property taken or damaged for public use. Printing presses, machinery or material devoted to publications of any kind are exempt from condemnation, and the buildings which house such objects may be condemned only after a judicial finding of public convenience and necessity.

Wire-tapping is prohibited. There is guarantee of the right of the people to be secure in their

persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. No warrant for arrest or search and seizure can be issued except by judicial authority and only upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation.

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused is presumed innocent, has the right to a speedy and public trial, to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with witnesses against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have assistance of Counsel. He cannot be compelled to be a witness against himself and his failure to testify can neither be taken into consideration nor commented upon against him.

In all prosecutions for a felony, the accused has the right of trial by an impartial jury of twelve residents of the district and the verdict must be by a majority vote and in no case less than nine. No person can be put twice in jeopardy of punishment for the same offense.

There is no imprisonment for debt. Before conviction, every accused person is entitled to be admitted to bail. No jail period, prior to trial, can exceed six months.

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude exists except in the latter case as a punishment for crime after the accused has been duly convicted. There cannot be cruel and unusual punishment. The right to vote and other civil rights are restored when the term of imprisonment has ceased.

The writ of *habeas corpus* is granted without delay and free of costs. The privilege of this writ cannot be suspended unless the public safety requires it as in the case of invasion, rebellion or insurrection and only the Legislative Assembly has the right to suspend this writ.

The military authority is subordinate to civil authority.

Participation in Government (Article 21)

The legislative power is vested in an autonomous Legislative Assembly consisting of a House of Representatives (lower house) and a Senate (upper house) elected by direct vote at each general election. There are unusual provisions, designed to protect minority political parties, guaranteeing them representation in the Legislative Assembly in proportion to their total voting strength whenever more than two-thirds of either house are elected from one political party. There are no property qualifications for the legislators.

The Chief Executive is the Governor who is elected by direct vote. The powers and duties of the Governor are those customarily found in State Constitutions. However, the Governor's emergency powers are more circumscribed than those of State Governors in regard to invoking martial law and the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*. In the case of the proclamation of martial law, the Legislative Assembly meets immediately

on its own initiative to ratify or revoke the proclamation.

All important territorial officials are now either elected directly by the people or appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In some cases the consent of the House is also required. For example, the Governor has the power to appoint all of the heads of the executive departments, the Justices of the Supreme Court and the Controller.

There is no literacy or property qualification to vote. There is universal adult suffrage.

Labor and Social Security (Articles 22, 23, 24 and 25)

There is prohibition of the employment of children less than fourteen years of age in any occupation which is prejudicial to their health or morals or which places them in jeopardy of life or limb. [Children less than 16 years of age cannot be kept in custody in a jail or penitentiary.]

The following rights are recognized for every employee: To choose his occupation freely and to resign; to equal pay for equal work; to a reasonable minimum salary; to protection against personal or health risks; and to an ordinary workday not to exceed eight hours. An employee may work in excess of eight hours only if he is paid extra compensation at a rate never less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

Persons employed by private businesses, enterprises and individual employers and by agencies of the government operating as private businesses or enterprises have the right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own free choosing. In order to assure their right to organize and to bargain collectively, these employees have the right to strike, to picket and to engage in other legal concerted activities.

A Department of Labour is provided for in the Constitution.

Education, Health and Welfare (Articles 25, 26 and 27)

The Preamble to the Constitution recognizes as one of the determining factors in their life the co-existence in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American Hemisphere. A qualification of a member of the Legislative Assembly is that he be able to read and write the Spanish or English language.

The Bill of Rights provides that every person has the right to an education which shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. There is a system of free and wholly non-sectarian public education at the elementary and secondary levels, and is compulsory in the elementary schools to the extent permitted by the facilities of the state. Compulsory attendance at public schools is

not required where students are receiving elementary education in schools established under non-governmental auspices. Only state supported schools can use public funds or public property.

Separate Departments of Education and Health are established.

Cooperation with the United Nations and other International Bodies (Article 28)—(Supplementary material)

Puerto Rico has developed a well coordinated program for the training of scholars and fellows of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. During 1952, Puerto Rico offered under this program the free use of its facilities to 56 fellows and scholars from Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, the Far East, the Near East and Africa. The training programs, which averaged three months each, were in the fields of agriculture, cooperatives, social welfare, health, housing, industrialization, public administration and planning, vocational education and community education. In addition, Puerto Rico has acted as host to visiting United Nations study groups.

To aid in developing "a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in the Declaration can be fully realized", as stated in Article 28, the United States Government reported in 1951 that its territories participated directly in two regional advisory Commissions—the Caribbean and the South Pacific Commissions. The United States Government further notes in this connection that by agreement of the six Member Governments of the South Pacific Commission in November 1951, the scope of that Commission was enlarged to include Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Supplementary Distribution of Crude Sulfur

The Sulfur Committee of the International Materials Conference (IMC) announced on October 20 a supplementary distribution of crude sulfur for the last 6 months of 1952.

Sixteen governments are represented on the Sulfur Committee. They are Australia, Belgium (representing Benelux), Brazil, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

On July 18, 1952, when the International Materials Conference set up proposals for the distribution of crude sulfur during the last 6 months of 1952, the plan of distribution was stated to be for the whole of the last 6 months, on the understanding that the Committee might review the allocation for the fourth quarter.¹ The Committee has

not found it necessary to carry out a general review of the allocation for the fourth quarter, but new evidence has been presented of increased export availabilities from certain exporting countries, mainly in Latin America. The original allocation also provided for a quantity to be set aside as a contingency reserve. The balance of this contingency reserve is now being distributed. After reviewing these factors the Committee has recommended a supplementary distribution of 29,800 long tons for the last 6 months of 1952.

Requests have been received from member and nonmember importing governments for increased import quotas, and in view of these, the Committee has agreed that the import quotas of the importing countries should be increased.²

Current United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography³

General Assembly

Information From Non-Self-Governing Territories: Summary and Analysis of Information Transmitted Under Article 73 e of the Charter. Report of the Secretary-General. Summary of information transmitted by the Government of Belgium. A/2129, Aug. 27, 1952. 34 pp. mimeo; Summary of general trends in the Territories under French administration. A/2131/Add.1, Aug. 8, 1952. 13 pp. mimeo; Summary of information transmitted by the Government of France. Corrigendum. A/2131/Add.2/Corr.1, Sept. 18, 1952. 16 pp. mimeo; Summary of information transmitted by the Government of New Zealand. A/2133, Sept. 24, 1952. 11 pp. mimeo; Summary of information transmitted by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. A/2134/Add.7, Sept. 10, 1952. 62 pp. mimeo. A/2134/Add.9, Sept. 30, 1952. 46 pp. mimeo; Summary of information transmitted by the Government of the United States of America. A/2135/Add.1, September 1952. 19 pp. mimeo; Supplementary Report on the Application of the Declaration of Human Rights in Non-Self-Governing Territories Administered by the United States of America. Information transmitted by the Government of the United States of America. A/2135/Add.2, Sept. 23, 1952. 10 pp. mimeo.

International Criminal Jurisdiction. Comments Received From Governments Regarding the Report of the Committee on International Criminal Jurisdiction. A/2186, Sept. 16, 1952. 48 pp. mimeo.

Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. A/2192, Sept. 19, 1952. 5 pp. mimeo.

¹ For allocation table showing the new import quotas, see IMC press release dated Oct. 16.

² Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

The United Nations Secretariat has established an Official Records series for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission which includes summaries of proceedings, resolutions, and reports of the various commissions and committees. Information on securing subscriptions to the series may be obtained from the International Documents Service.

³ BULLETIN of Aug. 4, 1952, p. 196.

The United States in the United Nations

[October 27-November 17]

General Assembly

Election of Members of Councils—At its plenary session on October 27, the Assembly completed action on the election of six members of the Economic and Social Council by electing Yugoslavia. The 40 votes in favor were one more than the required majority. Two days earlier, the Assembly had elected Australia, India, and Turkey and re-elected the United States.

On October 25 the Assembly also had elected three nonpermanent members to the Security Council (Colombia, Denmark, and Lebanon). At the same session it adopted a resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, postponing for the remainder of the session "consideration of all proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China and to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China." The vote was 42-7 (Burma, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, U.S.S.R.)-11 (Afghanistan, Bolivia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia). No vote was taken on a Soviet proposal to unseat the delegation of the Republic of China. The United States introduced the motion that the Assembly not vote on this proposal in view of the decision postponing consideration of all such proposals; the vote on the United States resolution was 45-6 (Burma, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukraine, U.S.S.R.)-4 (Afghanistan, India, Indonesia, Iran).

Elected to two impending vacancies on the Trusteeship Council on October 27 were El Salvador (55 votes) and Syria (53 votes).

Ad Hoc Political Committee—The Committee on October 27 resumed consideration begun the previous week on the first item on its agenda, the reports of John B. Blandford, Jr., Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. In a statement before the opening of debate, Mr. Blandford said that the Agency's new program "offers a way out of declining, deteriorating, degrading relief" for the more than 800,000 refugees still on the rolls. "Two hundred million dollars of economic investment in sound projects, with large employment

during construction, and with large secondary benefits, still stands as the answer to the futility of relief."

Philip Jessup (U.S.) opened the debate with a statement in which he paid tribute to the "skill and devotion" with which Mr. Blandford had so far carried out his tasks. He analyzed the reports under consideration, emphasizing his belief that the development of large-scale projects is the most important responsibility before the Agency. Only by such projects can the refugees substitute self-support for continuing relief. These projects must be coordinated with the economic developments in the areas of which they will be part, he said. (For full text, see p. 755.)

Mr. Jessup presented a joint draft resolution authorizing the Agency to increase its relief budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 to \$23,000,000.

The resolution was adopted October 30 (for text and vote, see p. 756).

Committee I (Political and Security)—On October 29 the U.S.S.R. entered the debate on the Korean item with a lengthy statement by Andrei Vyshinsky, who concluded by presenting a resolution which would "establish a commission for the peaceful settlement of the Korean question with participation of the parties directly concerned and of other states, including states not participating in the war in Korea," and would "instruct this Commission to take immediate measures for the settlement of the Korean question in the spirit of the unification of Korea, implemented by the Koreans themselves under the supervision of the above-mentioned Commission."

Following are excerpts from his statement:

On October 24 the First Committee heard a statement from the United States Secretary of State, who spoke for nearly three hours. He fixed his attention on the background and history of the Korean question from its inception to date. He misrepresented facts; he permitted himself a number of gross mistakes; and he did not even shrink from direct distortion.

From the very outset the Soviet Union Government consistently championed measures to establish the conditions for the setting up of a true independent, democratic and unified Korea.

The question of consultation with democratic parties has also been outlined by Mr. Acheson, to state it mildly, with a number of clear departures from reality.

Mr. Acheson devoted a substantial part of his speech to an attempt to indict the North Koreans—and the Soviet

Union also—for subversive activities in Southern Korea which were allegedly designed to overthrow the Syngman Rhee Government. In so doing he attached particular significance to the Soviet Union's activities in connection with the preparation of cadres of Koreans who were, he said, on the side of the Soviet Union and who occupied responsible party and state posts in North Korea.

Mr. Acheson said that this preparation and training of cadres was taking place in the Soviet Union and there were on that occasion a number of outbreaks. These were outbreaks, hostile to the Soviet Union, about the alleged Soviet Union secret police that was ranging throughout Southern Korea and about the Soviet Union domination which Mr. Acheson said was being exerted over the North Korea government. There is no reason further to emphasize the ludicrous and absurd character of such allegations.

Mr. Acheson stated that the activities of the Communist party in North Korea were designed to subvert the South Korean Government. Is it not clear that nothing was capable of subverting the authority of the South Korean Government as much as was the brutal reactionary policy to which that government was committed, since it found itself in overt war with its own people?

Is it not clear what the leaders of the South Korean Government were doing and what the leaders of the South Korean political and Fascist parties were preparing? They were preparing to attack North Korea; they were preparing for war. They said so, and not only did they say it, but they were working in that direction. They were working toward it, not in secret, but with the support, protection and connivance of their great protectors from beyond the seas.

Mr. Acheson devoted a great part of his speech to the thesis that the aggression in Korea was prepared and carried out from North Korea.

Among the pieces of evidence of aggression originating in North Korea, Mr. Acheson cited certain secret documents which included, he said, a plan for the invasion of South Korea which had been captured by United Nations troops and which now could be found in the archives of the United Nations. This is the first time we have heard about that. More than two and a half years have elapsed since our differences in Korea began, but this is the first time we have heard of this document.

Mr. Acheson argued that the issue in the cease-fire talks in Korea at the present time was what to do with those prisoners who did not want to be repatriated. Mr. Acheson alleged that this was quite in keeping with the principles of international law and international practice. But what he was doing in fact was to supplant one issue by the other.

The type of compulsory interrogation and screening that is being carried out actually means that the prisoners are being retained by force. Mr. Acheson requested that we consider this proposal and he stated that the United States' side was prompted by the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Convention and that the position of his side was fully in keeping with that convention. Mr. Acheson proposed that we consider this view and that we check up on whether this was correct.

We are prepared to consider this, to check it and to prove that it is not correct, that the position of the United States' side, far from being in agreement with the Geneva Convention, is actually in flagrant contradiction of the Geneva Convention, and not only of the convention of 1949, but also of the convention of 1929 and of the Hague Convention of 1907, as well as of the practices of the United States itself.

Mr. Acheson argued that the position of the United States was fully in keeping with the standards of international law and practice. Let us look into that. Mr. Acheson deemed it fit to draw attention to a number of treaties that were entered into by the Government of the Soviet Union in the first year of the revolution. He cited a number of agreements entered into by the Soviet Government in 1918, 1919 and 1920 which make it clear that

that Government, as Mr. Acheson alleged, did not press for repatriation of all those war prisoners who might prefer to remain in the territory of the power under whose authority they were.

However, Mr. Acheson seemed to think that his task was easier than it actually is. Having refrained from the labor of analyzing the above list of treaties, he just cited texts. He eliminated the conditions and the reality of that day. He just saw before him the dry-as-dust texts, the legal juridical formulas and forgot the social and political relations under which those texts arose on which the events that were raging then placed their stamp.

There was a struggle on contradictory political conceptions and of social and class interests that were antagonistic. The treaties referred to by Mr. Acheson were merely the result of that struggle and it was natural that the stamp of compromise could not have failed to be put upon them. This fact must not be lost sight of, inasmuch as it is correct to evaluate and appraise the documents only in their political and historical settings.

The United Kingdom and France replied to Mr. Vyshinsky's proposal at the next session, October 30. Selwyn Lloyd (U.K.) said that he did not see how the commission proposed by the U.S.S.R. would help end the Korean war if the Soviet delegate would not acknowledge the basic principle of non-forcible repatriation, and, on the other hand, if that principle were accepted no commission would be necessary. "We are not only ready but eager to examine any and every proposal that may be put forward in good faith to overcome the present difficulty, provided it does not involve forcible repatriation."

Stating that his intention was not merely to refute Mr. Vyshinsky's arguments, Mr. Lloyd declared:

"It is impossible to forget that whilst we are debating this matter men are dying in Korea. Every day there are casualties, not only to the soldiers concerned, but also, unfortunately and unavoidably, among noncombatants."

Speaking for France, Henri Hoppenot referred to Mr. Vyshinsky's statement that the Soviet Union had signed treaties providing for voluntary repatriation only under the special circumstances that followed the Russian revolution. He proposed that the Soviet delegate join in an examination of the question whether "special circumstances" also exist at present to justify exceptions to the Soviet stand on repatriation.

M. Hoppenot urged that every effort be exerted to reach an "honorable" solution. He said he addressed his appeal especially to those nations "culturally and geographically" closer to the Chinese and North Koreans, who were therefore perhaps in a better position to explain to them the real position of the United Nations.

Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural)—In the course of its consideration of freedom of information, the Committee on November 1 adopted a resolution sponsored by Egypt, France, Lebanon, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia which would open for signature a Convention on the Right of Correction.

In a statement on October 24, Charles A.

Sprague (U.S.) said that the right-of-correction provisions of the Convention on the International Transmission of News and the Right of Correction (adopted by the General Assembly in 1949 but not opened for signature) "could be badly abused" and could become a vehicle for propaganda and even a source of friction among States.

During the subsequent discussion, the representative of Byelorussia, Miss F. A. Novikova, charged that in the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, information media were misused by "aggressive circles" to mislead public opinion. Amendments proposed by the U.S.S.R. to the draft Convention on Freedom of Information would "promote the dissemination of truthful and objective information," independently of "dictation by trusts and monopolies."

Mr. Sprague later intervened to reply to charges made by the "representatives of the Soviet Union and other countries of the Soviet bloc."

"I am not unaware of defects in the American press," he said, but the picture presented to the Committee was so "grotesque and distorted" that he was unable to relate it to reality. Denying that there was a monopoly of ownership in the United States, Mr. Sprague said that ownership of the country's 1,773 daily newspapers and over 3,000 radio stations was most widely diversified.

(Full texts of Mr. Sprague's statements will appear in the next issue of the BULLETIN.)

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Movement of Migrants From Europe

The Department of State announced on October 10 (press release 802) that the U.S. delegation to the fourth session of the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, which convened on October 13, 1952, at Geneva is as follows:

U.S. Representative

George L. Warren, Adviser on Refugees and Displaced Persons, Department of State

Alternate U.S. Representative

Donald C. Blaisdell, U.S. Representative for International Organization Affairs, American Consulate General, Geneva

Advisers

David E. Christian, Mutual Security Agency, Paris
Eric M. Hughes, Deputy Chief, Escapee Program, Special Unit, Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany, Frankfort
Guy J. Swope, Chief, Displaced Populations Division, Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany, Bonn

At this session, the Migration Committee will consider reports on the various phases of its operations, including reports by the Director on such subjects as refugees of European origin resident outside Europe; budget and plan of expenditure

for the period February 1-August 31, 1952; technical aid and financing; staff regulations; and the establishment of headquarters.

Hugh Gibson, a former Ambassador of the United States, is Director of the Migration Committee, having been elected to that post at the Committee's third session, which was held at Washington June 10-13, 1952.

Pan American Congress of Architects

The Department of State announced on October 17 (press release 817) that the U.S. delegation to the eighth Pan American Congress of Architects, to be held October 19-25, 1952, at Mexico City, will be as follows:

Chairman

Glenn Stanton, President, American Institute of Architects, Portland, Oreg.

Delegates

Thomas D. Broad, Dallas
Samuel Inman Cooper, Atlanta
Clair William Ditchy, Detroit
Rockwell K. DuMoulin, Architect, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, San José, Costa Rica
Howard T. Fisher, Chicago
Raymond M. Foley, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.
Kenneth Franzheim, Houston
Morris Ketchum, Jr., New York
Donald R. Laidig, Housing Consultant, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Washington, D. C.
Pieter C. Pauw, Housing Adviser, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Quito, Ecuador
Henry Retter, Sanitary Engineer, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, San Salvador, El Salvador
Marshall A. Shaffer, Chief, Technical Service Branch, Division of Hospital Facilities, Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.
George Dick Smith, Jr., Buffalo
Mies van der Rohe, Chicago

This series of congresses was initiated in 1920 to enable the architects of the American countries to render greater services to the public, to the profession, and to the governments of their respective countries as a result of consideration of problems of education, ethics, and practices relating to architecture, as well as the relationship of the architect to contemporary civilization. The United States has participated in the seven previous congresses in the series.

The themes of the eighth congress will be continental, national, regional, and urban planning, with reference to the architecture of homes, hospitals, and university cities. The objective of the forthcoming meeting is to correlate ideas and accomplishments looking toward the solution of certain of the social problems of the Americas. The work program includes conferences, seminars, plenary sessions, and visits to the exhibits, both official and private, being held in conjunction with the congress. An exhibit depicting planning and contemporary architecture in the United States has been prepared under the auspices of the American Institute of Architects and the Department of State.

Africa	
LIBERIA: Point Four director appointed . . .	743
American Principles	
America's responsibility in today's world (Sargeant)	736
Propaganda attacks on U.N. and UNESCO (Mesta)	741
American Republics	
VENEZUELA: Oil imports and the U.S. economy	733
Asia	
KOREA:	
Communiqués regarding Korea to the Security Council	754
Communist position on armistice; texts of letters	751
Prisoner question and peace in Korea (Acheson)	744
Communism	
America's responsibility in today's world (Sargeant)	736
Trial of Bulgarian Catholic clergy	728
Europe	
BULGARIA: Trial of Catholic clergy	728
CZECHOSLOVAKIA:	
Commemoration of Czechoslovak independence day (Truman letter)	732
Letter of Credence	733
Human Rights	
Human rights provisions in the Puerto Rican constitution	758

Check List of Department of State**Press Releases: Oct. 25-Nov. 1, 1952**

Releases may be obtained from the Office of the Special Assistant for Press Relations, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press releases issued prior to Oct. 25 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 802 of Oct. 10, 817 of Oct. 17, 820 of Oct. 20, 822 of Oct. 20, 825 of Oct. 21, 828 of Oct. 22, 830 of Oct. 23, 831 of Oct. 23, 835 of Oct. 24, and 837 of Oct. 24.

No.	Date	Subject
†842	10/25	Pan American highway congress
†843	10/28	Frequency planning (Icao)
*844	10/28	Sauer: Chilean inauguration
*845	10/28	Death of Lt. Gen. Sir Harold Briggs
846	10/28	Employment in U.N.
*847	10/29	Pt. 4 technicians assigned
*848	10/30	Mesta: The strength of the free Engineers to Mexican commission
†849	10/30	Mesta: Struggle for European unity
†851	10/30	St. Lawrence seaway
*852	10/31	Johnston: Point 4 tour of S. America
*853	11/1	VOA coverage of election

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

International Information Administration	
Religion and the "Voice of America" (Lyons)	727
International Meetings	
U.S. DELEGATIONS:	
Movement of migrants from Europe	763
Pan American Congress of Architects	763
Mutual Aid and Defense	
Free world rediscovers Turkey (Byroade)	729
Near East	
ISRAEL: Continued support urged for Palestine relief program (Jessup), text of resolution	755
TURKEY: Free world rediscovers Turkey (Byroade)	729
Presidential Documents	
CORRESPONDENCE: Commemoration of Czechoslovak independence day	732
Prisoners of War	
Communist position on armistice; texts of letters	751
Prisoner question and peace in Korea (Acheson)	744
Puerto Rico	
Human Rights provisions in the Puerto Rican constitution	758
Refugees and Displaced Persons	
Continued support urged for Palestine refugee program (Jessup), text of resolution	755
Strategic Materials	
Oil imports and the U.S. economy (Eakens)	733
Supplementary distribution of crude sulfur	760
Technical Cooperation and Development	
Point Four director for Liberia appointed	743
Trade	
Additional fees on imported filberts found unjustified (Truman)	743
Treaty Information	
Oil imports and the U.S. economy (Eakens)	733
United Nations	
Communiqués regarding Korea to the Security Council	754
Communist position on armistice; texts of letters	751
Human rights in the Puerto Rican constitution	758
Prisoner question and peace in Korea (Acheson)	744
Propaganda attacks on U.N. and UNESCO	741
U.N. documents: a selected bibliography	760
U.N. staff appointments	735
U.S. in the U.N.	761
Name Index	
Acheson, Secretary	744
Blaisdell, Donald C.	763
Byroade, Henry A.	729
Davis, John W.	743
Eakens, Robert H. S.	733
Gibson, Hugh	763
Jessup, Phillip C.	755
Lyons, Roger	727
Mesta, Perle	741
Petrzelka, Karel	733
Sargeant, Howland H.	736
Stanton, Glenn	763
Truman, President	732, 743
Warren, George L.	763